DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 446 SO 016 244

AUTHOR Herzig, Margaret McCarthy
TITLE The History of the Project on Human Potential. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Bernard Van Leer Foundation, The Hague (Netherlands).
PUB DATE Sep 84
NOTE 226p.; Paper from the Project on Human Potential. For other project papers, see SO 016 245-270.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Biology; Case Studies; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Context; *Cultural Differences; Cultural Influences; Developmental Psychology; Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instruction; Intelligence; Interdisciplinary Approach; Learning Experience; *Learning Processes; Literature; Philosophy; Policy Formation; Political Science; Program Descriptions
IDENTIFIERS Africa; China; Colombia; Egypt; *Human Potential; India; Japan

ABSTRACT

A five-year project that used evidence from a variety of disciplines and cultures to develop a framework to help educational policymakers identify ways of achieving the full range of human potential in a given population is described. The project sponsor is an international non-profit institution dedicated to the cause of disadvantaged children and youth. It supports innovative projects that develop community approaches to early childhood education and child care, in order to help disadvantaged children to realize their potential. Cross cultural case studies of how teaching and learning take place in various cultures including Japan, India, China, Colombia, Egypt, and Africa were developed. Scholars from the disciplines of developmental psychology, philosophy, literature, political science, and biology wrote papers examining their respective disciplines and human potential. Information was also gathered about cultural features that shape human potential and its realization through interviews, cross cultural meetings, and workshops. Descriptions are provided of four commercially published volumes that resulted from the project. The report is arranged into seven sections; following an introductory chapter describing the history and goals of the project, separate sections are devoted to developments and progress occurring during each of the five years of the project. A concluding chapter is followed by appendices listing people involved with the project and a list of papers prepared for the project. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254446

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. M. Herzig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Final Report to the

Bernard van Leer Foundation

THE HISTORY OF THE PROJECT ON HUMAN POTENTIAL

by Margaret McCarthy Herzig

Project on Human Potential
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Cambridge, Massachusetts

September, 1984

SP 016 214

Preface

This history was prepared at the request of Dr. Willem Welling, Executive Director of the Bernard van Leer Foundation, to document the evolution of a unique project designed to bring the research findings of a variety of disciplines and cultures to bear upon issues of policy making in educational development. While not all who helped to guide the Project could be mentioned in the text, we have attempted to list in Appendix A many of those people, including staff, participants in case studies, advisors, and consultants. Brief biographical sketches of the Project Principals are also included. Appendix B lists Project papers and indicates how access to them might be obtained.

The author wishes to thank the Project Principals, in particular Professor Lesser, for editorial support, Dr. White for preparation of summaries of several workshops and meetings, and Laura Stephens-Swannie for her willing and accurate interpretations of scribbles and arrows at the word processor.

Finally, on behalf of all Project members, I thank those at the Foundation, in particular Dr. Welling and Mr. van Leer, for sending us on this fascinating and important venture, and for their support and guidance over the course of the Project.

Cambridge, Massachusetts
September, 1984

Contents

I. Prehistory: The Challenge.... 1

II. Year One: Exploration and Self-Definition 8

A. The Agenda: Initial Research and Discussions 8

B. Intraproject Dialogue: Search for Linkage Points and Philosophical Clarification 14

C. Self-Evaluation and Planning: Priorities, Goals, and Framework Building 17

1. Priorities.....17
2. Project Goals: Questions of Audience, Form, and Content.....19
3. Framework Building: Early Thinking.....20

III. Year Two: Self-Definition Spurs Progress 26

A. The Agenda: Writing, Continued Planning, and Research 26

1. The First Annual Report.....26
2. Long-term Goals, Short-term Plans.....27
3. The Policy Maker Connection.....30
4. Psychology and Cognition.....31
5. Potential in Historical Perspective.....32
6. The Case Studies.....34

B. Intraproject Dialogue: Mutual Illumination.....39

C. Project - Foundation Dialogue: The Scientific Focus.....43

D. Continued Research.....45

1. The Scientific Briefs.....45
2. Progress in the Case Studies.....49
a. Teaching and Learning as a Central Theme.49

b. Workshop on American Education.....52
c. Japan.....55
d. India.....59
e. China.....61
f. Colombia.....61
g. Egypt.....62
h. Africa.....62

E. Intraproject Dialogue: Questions of Development.....62

F. Evaluation and Planning: Utilizing Advisors and Networks.....67

1. Outreach.....67
2. Project - Foundation Dialogue.....71

IV. Year Three: Volumes Defined, Case-Studies to Fruition..77

A. Overview.....77

B. Volume I: The Synthetic Volume.....78

1. Scheffler's "Synthetic Sketch".....78
2. Intraproject Dialogue.....83

C. Volume II: Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences.....87

D. Volume III: LeVine's and White's Cross-cultural Volume.....89

1. Research on Alternative Models of Development
   a. The Case Studies.....90
      1. India.....90
      2. Egypt.....95
      3. Japan.....97
      4. China.....101
      5. Latin America.....104
      6. Africa.....105
   b. The Teaching and Learning Seminars....106
2. Current Models of Development.....111

E. Evaluation and Planning: Utilizing Advisors and Networks.....114

1. Outreach.....114
   a. American advisors.....114
   b. International policy makers.....116
2. Project - Foundation Dialogue.....121

V. Year Four: Research, Writing, and Review.....124

A. Overview.....124

B. Volume I: Israel Scheffler's Of Human Potential 124

C. Volume II: Howard Gardner's Frames of Mind.....127

D. Volume III: Robert LeVine's and Merry White's Cultural Conditions.....133

1. Research.....133

a. The Case Studies.....133

1. Africa.....134
2. Latin America.....144

b. Teaching and Learning.....148

c. International Development.....153

2. Writing and Discussion.....162

E. Volume IV.....164

F. Dissemination and Review.....165

G. Project-Foundation Dialogue.....166

VI. Year Five: Writing, Review and Dissemination.....169

A. Overview.....169

B. Volume I: Discussion and Revision.....171

C. Volume II: Publicity and Follow Up.....177

D. Volume III: Writing and Discussion.....180

E. Volume IV: Paper Preparation.....184

VII. Conclusion.....186

Appendix A: People Involved with the Project on Human Potential

Appendix B: Papers prepared for the Project on Human Potential

I. Prehistory: The Challenge

In the course of a casual conversation in the Summer of 1978, Oscar van Leer, Chairman of Board of the Bernard van Leer Foundation, challenged Paul Ylvisaker, a member of the Board and then Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, with a question which, despite its enormous scope, Dean Ylvisaker chose to take seriously. The question (paraphrased by Dean Ylvisaker) was: "What do we all mean by 'human potential' and why aren't people like you, at eminent institutions like Harvard, farther along and more helpful in providing usable definitions, insights, and operational leads?"

This question, which arose in the context of the van Leer Foundation spending millions of dollars in more than thirty countries to "promote the realization of human potential," provoked Dean Ylvisaker to reflect upon the importance of scholarly inquiry into the nature of the realization of human potential and the importance of communicating to the world of research the "thought-in-action" approach used in Foundation projects around the world. Mr. van Leer's challenge clearly provided an opportunity for matching a team of researchers at Harvard with the policy makers at the Foundation. Recognizing, however, that direct efforts to seek funding for Harvard researchers from the Foundation would entail a conflict of

interests, Dean Ylvisaker wrote a very general proposal for instituting seminars on human potential at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and transmitted it to Dr. Willem Welling, Executive Director of the Foundation, asking that he and others at the Foundation give some consideration to these ideas without the Dean's "conflicting presence." Thus the seeds were sown for the Harvard Project on Human Potential.

The reaction at the Foundation to the proposal of such a broadly-defined academic venture was one of skepticism, tempered by the acknowledgment that at some point this difficult conceptual issue must be addressed, both as a general guide to an understanding of "human potential" and as a specific guide to the Van Leer Foundation's activities to promote its realization. The faculty members at Harvard with whom Dean Ylvisaker discussed the proposed project also reacted with mixed emotions. On one hand, such a project would provide a unique opportunity for interdisciplinary research of central importance to the world of international education. On the other hand, the topic was overwhelmingly broad, and seemed to carry connotations of a recent approach to psychology, the "human potential movement," which was held in low esteem. While the Board of Trustees at the Foundation and the team at Harvard, including Dean Ylvisaker, all judged the project to be risky, they ultimately decided it was a risk worth taking.

By the end of 1978, the Dean, with the help of his colleague, Professor Gerald Lesser, had enlisted a group of faculty members to draft a proposal. Most centrally involved were Dr. Howard Gardner, Dr. Harry Lasker, and Professor Robert LeVine.

The project described in their draft proposal was to consist of monthly seminars held over a three-year period, culminating in the production of at least one book. The areas of study proposed as starting points capitalized on the expertise of the principal investigators: artistic talent and symbol systems (Gardner); productivity and satisfaction in work (Lasker); and cultural conceptions of human potential (LeVine). The first year was to be spent exploring these areas and their possible connections, and choosing other focal areas of study. During Years Two and Three the seminars would be expanded to include visiting scholars from other disciplines and cultures. A workshop at the end of Year One would serve to set the agenda for Years Two and Three. The proposed budget for this project was $241,250.

In March of 1979, Dr. Welling and Mr. van Leer came to the United States to meet with the Harvard group. Present at that meeting were: Dean Paul Ylvisaker, Associate Dean Blenda Wilson, Professor Gerald Lesser, Professor Robert LeVine, Dr. Howard Gardner, Dr. Francis Keppel, Dr. Harry Lasker and Dr. Fred Jacobs. At that meeting, Mr. van Leer

proposed a "statement of mission" for the proposed project:

> "to identify, and develop ways and means to acquire what it takes in knowledge, understanding and skills, to ensure that human beings will optimally realize what they are capable of when duly catalyzed."

The Harvard group noted the need to examine issues of "optimal realization" with attention to the social and cultural environment which determines which potentials are recognized, valued, and reinforced. They asked for further clarification of the scope of the project's mission. In particular, they asked what kinds of development were to be excluded from consideration. Mr. van Leer replied that he was more interested in the "crystallization of basic 'senses'" than in development brought about by formal instruction. He urged that the project take on the ambitious goal of exploring the positive emergence of potential over the life course of all people, rather than focussing exclusively on remedial help for the "disadvantaged." He further challenged the group to develop a theoretical framework for thinking about human potential which would include concrete hypotheses and suggestions, and which could be tested and operationalized later by the Foundation.

Dr. Welling felt that if the project were to have such an expansive scope and ambitious mission, it would benefit from an additional year, a first year of "unrushed

reflection," during which the core group would begin to develop the framework to be elaborated in later years. He also suggested that Dean Ylvisaker include a philosopher on the research team. Finally, he insisted that the team heighten their sensitivity to cultural differences through travel rather than only through meetings in Cambridge with experts from other cultures. The meeting concluded with an agreement to rework the proposal and budget, and with an expression of enthusiasm for the Project.

Two months later, the Harvard group, now including a philosopher, Professor Israel Scheffler, responded to the Foundation's request for a more ambitious research project with a grant application for a four-year project with a budget of $1,096,989. Its stated objective was:

> to develop a framework for identifying and assessing ways and means of achieving the full range of human talents and capacities in a given population. The project will address issues such as: a) how to uncover potential if it is not yet visible; b) which factors impede or promote its growth; and c) how to measure the degree of its realization. Ultimately, the framework that is developed will be made available to practitioners whose task it is to optimize the realization of human capabilities in diverse cultural settings.

During the first year, the group proposed not only to gather what was known within their fields of expertise, but also to assess the bounds and depths of ignorance about the realization of human potential. Again, the first year was

seen as a time of exploration and agenda setting. To a greater extent than in the earlier draft proposal, the group stressed the need for attention to cultural relativity in understanding how humans set and achieve (or fail to achieve) their goals of development over the life course. Toward this end, and in response to Dr. Welling's fears that the Project might be too closely bound to American culture, the group requested that in Years Two and Three the Project hold regional conferences in other parts of the world. Further, they proposed that a final report on the Project be given at an International Symposium at the end of the fourth year.

Within two weeks of submission of the revised grant proposal, Dr. Welling and his advisor, Dudley Grant, of Jamaica, paid a visit to Harvard to discuss the project. At that time Dr. Welling communicated both enthusiasm and concern. He reiterated his support for the international scope of the project, and in particular, for the direct involvement of non-Western scholars. His concerns stemmed from the broad and abstract definition and goal of the project. He feared that, given the different biases of the principal investigators, the charting of a definite course would be very time consuming. He suggested that the project have a single director (specifically, Associate Dean Blenda Wilson) to mediate in this process, and he strongly urged that the topic be delimited. In an effort to lend focus to the project, he suggested that the following areas of

research be investigated as they related to the identification and realization of human potential:

a. the influence of home education
b. the influence of child rearing practices
c. the influence of formal education
d. the influence of teaching conditions
e. societal influences: values, beliefs and needs.

Both Dr. Welling's enthusiasm and concerns were shared by the group at Harvard, and his suggestions for topics to study were accepted.

On June 21, 1979, Dean Ylvisaker was informed, by telex from Dr. Welling, that the Board of Trustees had appropriated $1,096,489 for a Project on the Realization of Human Potential at Harvard Graduate School of Education. Dr. Welling wrote that the Trustees as well as the Executive branch of the Foundation were greatly pleased to institute "this novel form of intellectual cooperation."

II. Year One: Explorations and Self-Definition

The Project on Human Potential began in September of 1979 under the co-direction of Drs. Lasker and Gardner. In response to Dr. Welling's request that a single person oversee the progress of the Project, Professor Lesser agreed to serve as Chairman of the Steering Committee (Dr. Wilson was not available for the assignment). While the Project Principals agreed that, eventually, the Project would be best managed by one person, they agreed to postpone until after the first year the hiring of a single full-time manager "to have the responsibility for execution of the blueprint years two through four."

A. The Agenda: Initial Research and Discussions

The major task of the first year of the Project was to design the blueprint that would transform expertise in a variety of fields into a synthetic theoretical framework for understanding human potential and its realization. The choice of initial areas for study was relatively easy. Each Project Principal was involved in research of clear relevance to the study of human potential. While keeping in mind the ultimate goals of synthesis and of broadening the reaches of the Project beyond their own areas of expertise, the Project Principals proceeded in the first few months to

explore the contributions that their own and related fields would make to the Project. Dr. Gardner directed an interdisciplinary research group and Professor LeVine directed a cross-cultural research group. Dr. Lasker worked with both groups and sought to encourage mutual illumination between them.

Professor LeVine began by enlisting the aid of Dr. J. Raul Magana, a post-doctoral Fellow from Mexico, and Shelagh O'Rourke, a doctoral student in Human Development, to assist him in surveying methods of ethnopsychology, the study of indigenous concepts of the person, mental processes, and individual development over the life span in diverse cultures.

While directing these scholarly efforts, Professor LeVine also began to develop cross-cultural case studies of concepts relating to human potential, studies which would involve scholars from diverse cultures. The first case-study country to be chosen was Japan: a country where modernization has occurred at a rapid pace, yet was accompanied by a conscious effort at preserving an indigenous framework for social and personal development. Professor LeVine commissioned a paper on the Japanese concept of self from Dr. Merry White of the East Asian Studies Department at Harvard and worked with Dr. White to establish a correspondent group of Japanese scholars. Dr. White was

assisted by Lois Tanuichi, a doctoral student in Human Development and a teacher of the Suzuki method of musical training.

The second case-study country to be chosen was India: a society in which rich conceptions of the development of the self has been developed over the millenia. Through the Social Science Research Council, Professor LeVine contacted McKim Marriott of the University of Chicago who was working with a group of scholars and therapists on Hindu concepts of the self.

With the assistance of doctoral student Julia Shiang, Professor LeVine began preparations for a Project visit at Harvard with Fei Xiaotong, Director of the Institute of Sociology, Beijing. This visit initiated a third case study of the People's Republic of China, where vast experimentation in social and economic change had recently undergone rethinking and adjustment.

With Dr. Magana, Professor LeVine began to develop a network of scholars and practitioners to carry out a case study of Mexico, where the conflict between belief systems and patterns of development has presented a challenge to social and economic stability.

Finally, Professor LeVine instituted regular meetings

with staff and colleagues, including Drs. Lasher and White, to formulate procedures for conducting the case studies. They sought to formulate procedures which would allow for cross-cultural comparison while also encouraging the unique nature of the cultural conceptions of human potentials to emerge without predetermination by Western social science perspectives.

While Professor LeVine was pursuing the cross-cultural perspective, Dr. Gardner established an interdisciplinary research group incorporating developmental psychology, philosophy, literature, political science, and biology. He conducted interviews with scholars representing these diverse academic disciplines and supervised the preparation of Project papers by graduate assistants. Ms. Taniuchi, Dr. White's assistant on the Japanese case, worked with Dr. Gardner, reviewing literature on prodigies. Suzy Groden, a doctoral student at Harvard and a teacher of writing at the University of Massachusetts in Boston, prepared a working paper "Language, Literacy and the Realization of Human Potential." Lisa Brooks, a doctoral student in genetics, explored the possible implications of her field for studies of human potential. A political and economic study was prepared by Thomas Carothers, a former student of Dr. Gardner's who was at the London School of Economics. Eftihia Voutira, a graduate student in philosophy of education, prepared a historical and philosophical account of the

concept of potential. Doctoral student James Moore worked with Drs. Gardner and Lasker on development of the self over the life course, using the life of Thomas Merton as a case study.

While these studies were in preparation, Dr. Gardner held interviews with scholars representing the biological and social sciences and philosophy. When interviewing a particularly accomplished individual (e.g., psychoanalyst Erik Erikson), he not only sought advice as to the issues of crucial importance to the topic, but he also raised questions concerning the realization of the individual's own potential. In contrast to the original plan of bringing a large number of "experts" to the project, Dr. Gardner judged it most economical, financially, and in terms of the time resources of Project members, to conduct personally a large number of interviews with scholars and to prepare detailed notes for Project members. Most of these interviews were with American residents or visitors, but in November of 1979, he and Dr. Lasker discussed the Project with Dr. Welling and his associates in the Hague and with a number of scholars in Great Britain and Holland.

A small number of eminent scholars whose topics most clearly addressed the linkage areas between the "cross-cultural" and "interdisciplinary sides" of the Project were brought to Harvard to engage in discussion with

well-prepared Project members. Among those scholars were: Noam Chomsky, a linguist, and proponent of a nativist theory of mind; William Fowler, a developmental psychologist concerned with prodigious achievement and literacy; Michael Cole, a psychologist concerned with the interface between mind and culture; and Jerome Bruner, an eminent developmental and educational psychologist. Dr. Gardner was also instrumental in attracting David Feldman, a developmental psychologist from Tufts University, to serve as a Visiting Scholar during the Spring and Summer of 1980. Professor Feldman's work is on domains of development (ranging from the unique to the universal) and on developmental transitions.

Over the course of the first several months of the Project, Professor LeVine also brought a select group of speakers to the Project, who served to educate Project members about the wide cultural diversity of concepts of human potential. For example, Catherine Lutz presented research findings from her work in Micronesia on categories of emotion (there is no heart/mind dualism), valued traits (defining self in terms of others' needs, hard work, strict conformity) and deviant traits (anger, innovation). Stanley Brandes of the University of California, Berkeley, presented findings from his work in Spain and Mexico; he discussed women's self-definitions (in terms of family relationships) and indigenous explanations of poor development (due to a "bad nature"). Fei Xiaotong, of the

Institute of Social Sciences, PRC, discussed Chinese and American attitudes toward choice. Kathryn Pyne Parsons, a philosopher from Smith College, presented findings from her work on women and social change, and discussed the form of ethnocentrism that arises within a culture when differences of gender and race are ignored. Dr. White and Ms. Taniuchi presented their paper on the Japanese self in society, "The Anatomy of the Hara." Deborah Davis-Friedmann of Yale University presented her work on Chinese conceptions of self and Charlotte Ikels of the Harvard Graduate School of Education presented her work on the traditional Chinese family.

B. Intraproject Dialogue: Search for Linkage Points and Philosophical Clarification

Throughout the Winter and Spring months, some progress was made in identifying themes and areas of study which might serve to bridge the cross-cultural and interdisciplinary groups. The topic of literacy was proposed by Dr. Gardner as an unifying topic. Language is a human capacity about which much is known through the biological and cognitive sciences (particularly since the Chomskian revolution in linguistics) and which manifests itself in various ways in different cultures. Its artistic use is variously valued. Its "untranslatable" aspects provide a window through which we discover the uniqueness of cultural conceptions. Ms.

Groden's paper on writing and Mr. Moore's paper on Thomas Merton's life had brought out the power of skills of literacy to transform self-conceptions. Finally, literacy is a highly valued goal of developing societies, as a means of fostering an educated citizenry and technological advancement.

Early discussion of literacy as an individual and social goal, and discussion of Lois Taniuchi's work on prodigies were particularly helpful in demonstrating the need to analyze questions of realization of potential using a "trade-off" or cost-benefit model. Not all potentials can be realized at the same time in one individual, nor can a particular potential in a society (e.g., literacy) be promoted without social costs (e. g., the effects of schooling) and economic costs. Realization is a function of investment, and societies as well as individuals must decide which investments are most worth making.

In December of 1979, Professor Scheffler added the philosophical perspective to the interdisciplinary mix and presented a conceptual analysis of human potential which further elaborated on this notion of potential as a matter of choice and investment. In its common usage, "human potential" is used to denote an "unrealized" quality of an individual, the growth of which can be impeded or promoted and the degree of realization of which might even be measurable. These were some of the terms used, with some

uneasiness, by the Harvard group in their original grant proposal. Professor Scheffler identified the source of uneasiness with which social scientists use the term "potential" by pointing out that such common usage skirts questions of context and value. Questions of potential, Professor Scheffler argued, are indeterminate unless criteria and contextual information are supplied. To attribute potential to a person ought not be viewed as an attribution of an inborn quality. Rather, to claim that a person does or does not have a potential, (if that claim is complete) is to make a claim not only about individual ability, but also about the availability of resources and the conditions that affect performance.

For example, if one denies the potential of person X for behavior Y one must elaborate, or complete the claim, with reference to the preventative conditions or circumstances. This process of making a potential attribution complete exposes underlying value questions. For example, if X's lack of potential for Y is claimed to be due to lack of training, or due to social mores that say X's don't do that sort of thing in this society, one can make a sensible assessment as to whether those conditions hold and what investment might be made to change or overcome them. Thus, potential does not reside solely in the individual, to be objectively discovered, promoted, and measured. Rather, it is a function of the current state of the individual (e.g., genetic

proclivities, developmental stage, etc.), and the context in which the individual finds himself or herself (historical, educational, cultural, political, economic, psychological, etc.).

While the reconceptualization of human potential offered by Professor Scheffler served the purpose of providing a skeletal theoretical framework for integrating various aspects of the Project, it also accentuated the broad, all encompassing nature of the concept: If all of those contextual features mentioned above are of crucial relevance, which issues addressed by philosophy and the biological and social sciences over the centuries could be seen as not relevant to issues of the realization of potential? How were priorities to be assigned?

C. Self-Evaluation and Planning: Priorities, Goals, and Framework Building

1. Priorities

In the Spring of 1980, Drs. Lasker and Gardner and Professor Lesser joined a Harvard Graduate School of Education delegation to the People's Republic of China. This represented an initial foray, as students of human potential, to a culture whose traditions and recent social experiments reveal the great diversity in cultural conceptions of human

potential and its realization. They returned from that trip to, perhaps, the most demanding task of the entire Project: to delimit its scope, and to choose among the innumerable topics, issues, and types of analysis those which would be most fruitful, in fact crucial, to developing an illuminating theoretical framework for understanding human potential and its realization.

As an initial attempt to begin this process of delimitation and goal-setting, Dr. Lasker, who was at this time the Project Director,[1] asked each Project Principal and staff member to write a brief list of topics which they would argue to be of crucial importance to the Project, along with an ordering of those topics. This assignment revealed the difficulty of the task. Not only were the suggested topics extremely diverse, but they were accompanied by spirited supporting arguments and a clear realization that not all topics about which Project members felt strongly could be pursued in depth. The only clear consensus derived from this experience was that the senior members of the Project who

1. In January, 1980, Dr. Gardner asked to have his role in the Project redefined. The amount of time that he could devote to the Project was limited, and he felt that it would be best used to provide intellectual direction in the "interdisciplinary" research group. He argued that the responsibility for administrative management would be best handled by one Project Director, and that Dr. Lasker could devote more time than he could to providing Project-wide management and leadership.

ultimately bore the responsibility for its success must come together for regular intensive meetings during the Summer months to delimit the topic and to further define Project goals.

In June of 1980, the "Forum" was instituted to bring together, with regularity and frequency, the Project Principals along with, in most cases, their research staff. The first several Forum meetings were used to sharpen our definition of Project goals and to bring to closure the first year of exploration and planning. Forum meetings continued to be held over the entire course of the Project to discuss Project business, to assess progress toward "synthetic" goals, to discuss the crystallized ideas and papers produced in the working groups, and finally, to critique manuscripts for what would become the four Project volumes.

2. Project Goals: Questions of Audience, Form and Content

In the context of discussions of topics for focussed study and of central themes most crucial to the development of a theoretical framework, questions of audience, naturally, arose: Whose concept of human potential do we hope to illuminate? How, and in what form, might our research be made of interest and use to them?

It was agreed that "policy makers" and "practitioners" constituted our logical audience but the relative emphasis on one or the other vacillated over the course of the Summer meetings. Finally, it was agreed that if the Project played from its strengths as broad-based and interdisciplinary, its recommendations would be broad -- of more direct interest to policy-makers (e. g. international development agencies) than to practitioners (e. g. fourth-grade teachers). While practitioners, we hoped, would find our analyses and conclusions of interest, addressing their specific concerns would require more narrowly defined, context-bound research than that for which our Project was designed.

This decision led to further questions: What are the concerns of policy makers? How do they think? How can our areas of expertise and the uniqueness of this Project be translated into a theoretical framework of use to them? One decision reached during those Summer Forum meetings was to plan meetings and studies in the coming year which would help us to answer these questions.

3. Framework Building: Early Thinking

In an effort to begin the process of framework building, each Project Principal presented at the Forum his current state of thinking about what had been learned during the

first year, what needed to be incorporated into the agenda for future study, where the points of linkage might be found, and what the final product might look like.

Dr. Gardner proposed that the final products of the Project be: 1) a set of three volumes separately authored by himself, Dr. Lasker and Professor LeVine; 2) a brief, more popular overview of the Project; and 3) a set of technical reports commissioned over the course of the Project which would provide the detailed supporting evidence for the other volumes. In his own volume, he proposed to develop a cognitive developmental model of the potential of individuals. This model would be supported by biological evidence but would also make use of the cross-cultural case study material. He would opt to extend the model beyond issues typically addressed by developmental psychologists e.g., to domains of achievement outside of the intellectual realm, and to issues of social organization, and to incorporate the idea of technological innovation as an extension of the mind. A central notion in his theory would be <u>constrained pluralism</u>, the notion that while a wide range of possibilities for development exist, those possibilities are not unbounded. Humans are primed for ways of knowing and behaving that are not endlessly varied or flexible. This is especially true of any particular individual in a particular context. Dr. Gardner's goal was to extend the developmental model both toward the biological realm, and

toward the social realm, where he would meet the work of his colleagues "half-way." His own focussed work would require additional attention to the biological sciences, and he judged that the Project as a whole would benefit from work in the fields of political science, economics, and the history of ideas.

Professor LeVine's work during the first year had focussed on comparative ethnopsychology. His plan for future work was to investigate the historical roots of cultural and ideological views of potential and to investigate, both comparatively and historically, issues of resource allocation as it affects forms and methods of the realization of human potential. He suggested that the issues of social psychology of immediate concern to Dr. Lasker, and of more peripheral concern to Dr. Gardner, be studied both historically and comparatively. Employing this schema, he argued, would lead the Project to address such important issues as: the distribution of education, health and economic benefits; the Western character and roots of our notions of intelligence and egalitarianism; and the relation between societal "goods," like schooling, and feelings of satisfaction as they are experienced over the life course.

Dr. Lasker's interest in the development of "self in context" placed him squarely between the more individual, biological orientation of Dr. Gardner and the more social,

economic and historical orientation of Professor LeVine. Dr. Lasker proposed to integrate these areas of research with a constructivist model which views humans as bringing to the world an epistemological framework for understanding and interacting with the world which shapes the world, which in turn shapes beliefs and action. In analyzing the societal contexts in which selves are defined and potential is realized, Dr. Lasker found it useful to employ metaphorical descriptions of societies as "field societies" in which potential is realized primarily through relationships, and "particle societies" in which potential is viewed as inhering in the individual who strives for autonomous accomplishment. He proposed to develop these ideas further in the light of his work on ego stage development. Furthermore, Dr. Lasker proposed that we, as a Project, cast a net for important issues of human potential by identifying a number of levels of analysis (e.g., social forms, the self, biological functioning) which could then be approached from both the cross-cultural orientation (which focusses on variation and uniqueness) and the biological orientation (which focusses on constraints and universals).

Finally, Professor Scheffler, who had become increasingly involved in the Project during the Summer of 1980, presented a further elaboration of his reconceptualization of human potential. He argued that the common notion of human potential harbors a number of

potentially misleading myths which are exposed by his analysis. One myth is that all potentials are positive. Clearly there are potentials for evil, and there are potentials which can be put to pernicious as well as beneficial uses. A second is that, if a potential exists, it is realizable. While a given child may have the potential to be a boxer or a ballet dancer, he may not have the time, energy, or inclination to realize fully both potentials; thus, a "trade-off" decision must be made. A third is that potentials exist in the individual awaiting discovery and promotion. In fact, not all potentials are currently knowable -- new potentials can be opened through various kinds of development, individual, social, and technological, and other potentials can be closed off. Furthermore, as discussed earlier, potentials exist relative to a context -- a context of resources, social conditions, developmental level, individual beliefs, and cultural values.
Professor Scheffler argued that these myths must be clearly identified so that our theoretical framework would not be contaminated and weakened by them. He began to outline such a framework.

These discussions of the deficiencies of the common notion of potential, at times, led the Project Principals to question the feasibility of its scholarly study, and to consider disposing of the concept in favor of the more academically "respectable" concepts of developmental theory.

Ultimately, however, it was decided that human potential was indeed a worthy topic of study, precisely because it lent itself to analysis in terms of value and choice. While one might convincingly argue that particular claims of the developmental sciences should be value-free, assessments of potential are clearly, on analysis, relative to systems of belief and allocation of resources. To develop a framework for such analysis, utilizing evidence from a variety of disciplines and cultures and making explicit the components of choice and value, was thus judged to be a worthy endeavor: such an effort might lead to more carefully thought out and responsible interventions in the world of policy and practice.

The first year of the Project thus came to an end with a sense of enthusiasm for pursuing the troublesome topic of human potential, and with a major task in progress: that of pulling together the best insights gleaned from the research and discussions of the first year into our first truly synthetic substantial document: our Report to the Foundation on Year One.

III. Year Two: Self-Definition Spurs Progress

A. The Agenda: Writing, Continued Planning, and Research

1. The First Annual Report

When the Project Principals reconvened in September of 1980 to begin the second year of the Project, Dr. Lasker had drafted the First Year Report. This draft represented a wide-ranging attempt to summarize and illustrate many of the ideas which had been generated in cross-cultural meetings concerning cultural features which shape human potential (e. g., the field/particle dimension). Dr. Lasker also incorporated in the draft ideas about kinds of systems as synthesizing categories (representational, computation, operating, and action), ideas which his colleagues found promising, but which required further discussion and elaboration. Dr. Lasker agreed to develop further these new ideas in a separate working paper. Dr. Gardner agreed to redraft the First Year Report.

The form of that report represented the substantial progress achieved over the Summer months. It was organized not around the goals and activities of the interdisciplinary and cross-cultural working groups, but rather, around

conceptual issues (e. g., the relativity of potential.) This, we knew, would be a sign of progress welcomed by Dr. Welling, as during the Summer months he had, on the basis of our correspondence in May, questioned the rationale of the separate research groups. While we continued to use separate working groups, our Summer Forum meetings had brought all Project members together regularly. With much philosophical guidance by Professor Scheffler, these meetings proved fruitful in identifying the deficiencies of the concept of potential as it is commonly used. The report submitted in October of 1980 presented our alternative view of potential as relative to beliefs, values, and resources. It also incorporated Professor Scheffler's further analysis of the concept of potential as a second-order capacity: a capacity to develop a capacity. This analysis revealed the developmental nature of the concept and made good sense of both the initial areas of research pursued by the Project and the chosen areas for future research: Dr. Gardner's research on the domains of cognitive development; Professor LeVine's on the ways in which cultures, self-concepts, and ideologies variously define the means and ends of development; and, Dr. Lasker's on the "constructivist" interactions between self and context over the life course.

2. Long-Term Goals, Short-Term Plans

Having succeeded in developing a skeletal theoretical

framework for issues of human potential, the Project Principals at this time felt hopeful that a substantial synthetic book could be written as the primary product of the project, along with more technical supporting documents. Dr. Gardner had suggested during the Summer months an outline for such a book which would begin with the philosophical elucidation of the concept, move on to individual chapters on kind of minds, kinds of selves and kinds of lives, and end with chapters on implications for policymaking. While the group did not commit itself to the exact form of this proposed outline, the Project began aiming its efforts toward the production of such a synthetic volume.

There was some concern over the paradoxical nature of the task of producing such a volume: How could we, as a group of Western scientists, recommend to our readers that notions of potential of our own Western tradition be viewed as suspect? Two responses to this dilemma which were at least implicit in the discussions at this time were: 1) We are not simply Western scientists uncritically employing models of Western science; we are, particularly in our cross-cultural work, casting our nets for alternative models of development and satisfaction over the life course, and 2) We are not attempting to make detailed recommendations to policy makers and practitioners. Rather, we are seeking, through our interdisciplinary and cross-cultural work, to illuminate issues of human potential and its realization --

to seek some invariance amidst the relativity of potential -- to find some middle ground between "objective science" and descriptive "folk theories." As Professor LeVine noted, the intellectual/social distinction that underlies the tension between "science" and "folk theories" is itself a Western notion. The problem with the notion isn't that it is Western, but that it dominates most discussions of potential, and often leads to misleading conclusions. Our task is not to define and reject what is Western, but rather to avoid uncritical adoption of the dominant perspective which is associated with Western science -- to avoid ethnocentrism.

The Project activities in the Fall and early Winter of 1980, the beginning of Year Two, were designed to address the concerns and the interests expressed during the final months of Year One: to become better acquainted with the world of policy-making; to "potentialize" concepts of development, employing notions of "trade-offs" and constrained pluralism; to broaden the Project with studies of contexts of development, e. g. of schooling and other institutions and ideologies which shape the means and goals of development; to bring an historical approach to these studies; and to continue to develop networks of scholars in case study countries who could assist us in exploring the variety of ways in which meaning is made and satisfaction is achieved over the course of life.

3. The Policy Maker Connection

Dr. Lasker arranged for Project meetings with individuals of, or well-acquainted with, the world of policy-making, including: Francis Keppel, Professor of Education and former U. S. Commissioner of Education and Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Dean Paul Ylvisaker and Associate Dean Blenda Wilson, of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Chris Argyris, Professor of Education and Organizational Behavior at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. James Botkin made a presentation at Forum on the lessons gleaned from his experience co-authoring the Club of Rome's No Limits to Learning. Dr. Lasker and Dr. Welling expressed mutual interest in planning a meeting at Harvard to discuss Project goals and procedures and to further accuaint us with the issues of relevance to policymakers. Dates in November were set.

This approach to the world of policy through interviews and meetings was supplemented by a research sub-project which was assigned to research assistant William Skrzyniarz and supervised by Dr. Gardner. Mr. Skrzyniarz researched, as a case study, the attempts made by Venezuelan Minister Luis Alberto Machado to transform the educational system of his country to effect equitable distribution of enhanced intellectual power to the masses. The purpose of the case

study was not to critique Machado's program, but to analyze its assumptions about intelligence and human development and to test the relevance of our emerging theory of potential for understanding the perspectives, contraints and opportunities of the policy-maker.

4. Psychology and Cognition

Dr. Gardner pursued his goal of developing an extended model of cognitive development by engaging in dialogue with a variety of scholars and by directing literature reviews by graduate assistants.

One of Dr. Gardner's major concerns at this time was to discover the biological bases of "constrained pluralism." In particular, he questioned what range of environments -- from what we would call "deprived" to "enriched" -- would afford normal neural development. A graduate of the Harvard University Biology Department, Susan McConnell, was asked to review literature on early experience and neural development. She concluded, from her review of experimental studies with animals and from studies of naturally-occurring dysfunctions in humans, that deprivation of early experience can produce permanent deficits in neural function, but that the various areas and subsystems of the brain exhibit both different degrees of tolerance for deprivation (i. e. plasticity) and different critical periods for stimulation. While

deprivation of sensory stimulation was shown to cause permanent damange in some cases, Ms. McConnell argued that there was a wide range of relatively normal environments that would afford normal neurological functioning, and she noted that no experimental evidence suggested that a super-enriched environment would produce a "super-brain."

At a conference on The Right Hemisphere and Cognition, Dr. Gardner engaged in discussions with other scientists on the existence of general versus specific cognitive functions, on definitions of cognitive domains, on natural versus trained skills, and on theories of metacognition. He held interviews with Howard Gruber, a developmental psychologist and biographer concerned with the creative process in adults, and with Alexander Marshack, a scientist concerned with culture and the evolution of cognitive capacities. Also, Dr. Gardner hosted a presentation by Professor Tseng Sing Chu of the PRC, on the teaching of math and music, and a second presentation by Professor William Fowler on accelerated language development.

5. Potential in Historical Perspective

Two papers written in the Fall of 1980 brought historical perspective to our study of human potential and its realization. The first, written by research assistant Susan Pollak, under the direction of Dr. Gardner, surveyed

the history of ideas of human perfectibility, utopias and progress from the Greeks to the Enlightenment. This study attempted to identify the historical and philosophic roots of our "Western" notions of potential in order to more clearly contrast them with those of other cultures, and in order to understand better the often implicit assumptions underlying contemporary intervention programs devised by individuals who draw upon the Western intellectual tradition. As its organizing motifs, Ms. Pollak's paper used the dualisms of the individual and the community; religion and science; and urban versus agrarian ideals.

The second historical paper was written by Professor LeVine on the social processes of the last century which have shaped conditions of childhood. This paper, entitled "The Social Conditions of Child Development: An Historical and Comparative Perspective" documented four trends in world history: 1) from agrarian societies to urban-industrial societies; 2) from high mortality and fertility to low mortality and fertility; 3) from informal schooling to formal "Western" schooling; and 4) from private and varied conceptions of child development to a public and scientific interest in child development. One conclusion of this paper which was further elaborated in Professor LeVine's later work was that the introduction of mass schooling often has unintended and far-reaching consequences, some harmful, some beneficial.

6. The Case Studies

In the Fall of 1980, Dr. Merry White, who had undertaken the Project's Japanese case study, was appointed Coordinator of Case Studies. (Later in the year she became Associate Director, and in the following year she became Director of the Project.) She worked with Professor LeVine to establish procedures and select topics for the comparative study. Based on their work in ethnopsychology and their experience with international dialogue, Dr. White and Professor LeVine approached two of their tasks with particular concern for cultural sensitivity: the selection of scholars, and the posing of questions to those scholars. They took great care to select scholars and practitioners who had significant training or experience in the West, but who were also deeply involved in and respectful of their own cultural traditions and perspectives. They sought to formulate questions for these "border" scholars and practitioners which would cast a broad net for unique conceptions of human potential while being specific enough to generate bodies of information susceptible to cross-study comparison.

During the first two years of the Project, the merits of a number of case study questions and themes were debated. In October of 1980, Dr. White and Professor LeVine generated a lengthy list of questions, any cluster of which may or may

not (tellingly) be judged by our informant scholars to be relevant to (or even translatable for) their particular case. The questions fell into the following categories: Indigenous Schooling and Learning; Persons in Families and Organizations; Adult Change and Growth; Women's Lives; Religion and other Spiritual and Normative Influences; Child Development; Science, Technology and Communication; and The Assimilation of Foreign Ideas.

While each case study was allowed to develop in its own way, to truly represent the conceptions and concerns of that country, the general procedure for establishing the case studies involved: 1) selecting scholars and practitioners to form a correspondent group; 2) commissioning at least one "catalytic" paper from either a "border" scholar or an American scholar who would serve to select and organize the correspondent group; 3) seeking institutional collaboration for the planning of meetings; 4) building upon the catalytic paper through correspondence and the writing of working papers; 5) generating more elaborated statements from the correspondent groups to be presented at workshops; and finally, 6) incorporating insights gained from the individual case studies into an organizing framework.

The Japanese case study was established early in the first year of the Project. By the beginning of the second year, the catalytic paper (Dr. White's "Hara" paper) was

complete. Dr. Sumiko Iwao, a social psychologist from Keio University, and Professor Seizaburo Sato, a political scientist from Tokyo University, had agreed to work with Dr. White to select other group members. Endorsement by the Social Science Research Council was secured for the work of this group.

The Indian case study emerged in the second year of the Project with the appointment of Dr. B. K. Ramanujam as a Scholar-in-Residence. Dr. Ramanujam, an Indian psychiatrist residing in New York, made monthly visits to the Project and produced a number of "catalytic" papers to serve as the basis of discussion not only of the Indian case but of comparative conceptions of potential in Japan, the U. S., and India. Also playing leading roles in the development of the Indian case, as visitors and correspondents, were Dr. Sudhir Kakar, an Indian psychoanalyst, and Dr. Alan Roland, a psychotherapist studying Indian concepts of the self and interpersonal relations. In January of 1981, Dr. White traveled to India and Japan to meet with scholars who had been recommended for participation in the further development of the Indian and Japanese case studies.

The catalytic paper for the Chinese case study was prepared by Dr. Deborah Davis-Friedmann of Yale University during the Summer of 1980. She informed us of a group in China whose work and goals seemed to parallel ours: The

Institute for Rencaiology (the study of human talent). The Institute was established in 1979 under the sponsorship of the Ministry of Education in Beijing for the purpose of considering questions relating to the discovery and utilization of human talent, especially in the wake of the Cultural Revolution. Dr. Xia Shuzhang, a Visiting Professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Vice-President of Zhongshan University in Canton, facilitated our correspondence with the Rencai group. He interpreted the Rencai materials for us, reacted to our Project papers, and acted as general advisor on the Chinese case.

During January of 1981, the Project hosted an extended visit with Professor Fei Xiaotong, who had paid us a brief but very fruitful visit during the previous year. Professor Fei was a "border" scholar par excellence. He spoke with passion about the "ethnic" potential of China and about the importance to China of locating its own methods and timing for realizing its potential. He critiqued our classification of China as a "field society" concerned with social norms and "embeddedness" and America as a "particle society" concerned with freedom and individuality. While he agreed that the Chinese have more respect for their historical and ecological context, he questioned the strictures/freedom dichotomy. Norms, he argued, are not strictures but models which guide action in socially productive ways. As for freedom, he claimed there are two types: that defined by lack of

obstacles, and that defined by the presence of choices. Americans, he argued, are simply more concerned with the latter than the former. While he felt the field/particle metaphor oversimplified cultural differences, he spoke of the need for metaphor to provide a common language of discourse across cultural boundaries. He spoke movingly of the need to educate the world to understand cultural differences: "God let us develop our ethnic differences, but we must live together. This is not a particle problem or a field problem, but a common problem."

In the Fall of 1980, Dr. Carlos Corona Ibarra of Mexico met with Project members to plan a Mexican case-study. He proposed that his Institute of Psychiatric and Psychosomatic Medicine co-sponsor a workshop with our Project entitled "International Congress on Individual and Social Development" to be held in Guadalajara. Tentative topics, participants, and dates were set.

It was decided during the Summer of 1980, in consultation with Dr. Welling, to choose an Islamic nation for cross-cultural study and to consider choosing an African nation as well. To assist us in setting an Islamic case study in motion, Dr. Welling referred us to Dr. Chris van Niewenhuyze, a sociologist with expertise in Egyptian culture, who visited our Project for the purpose of introducing Egyptian perspectives and suggesting individuals

to serve as correspondents. Dr. van Niewenhuyze suggested that we prepare explicit statements about Western views of potential for use in cross-cultural comparison with Egypt. He emphasized that the notion of potential is a Western one, with Christian roots. The Egyptians must be invited to react to our general concerns on their own terms. He also suggested that we prepare for dialogue with the Egyptians concerning metaphysical and philosophical issues, as the Egyptian case would be likely to have such a focus, as opposed to the more psychological focus of the other cases. In the Spring of 1981, Dr. Lasker traveled to Cairo to assemble a correspondent group and to make plans for a workshop during the following year. Professor Daniel Wagner of the University of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Mona Seragaldin, a regional planner from Cairo, also assisted in planning the workshop.

B. Intraproject Dialogue: Mutual Illumination

Over the course of the Fall and early Winter of 1980, work on the case studies and on the various subprojects described above was discussed at Forum meetings and within working groups. The "mutual illumination" which was hoped for in Year One was, to a great extent, realized in Year Two. The meetings with Dr. Ramanujam often exhibited this quality of mutual illumination. For instance, Dr. Ramanujam described the Indian guna (translated: attribute or

predisposition) as consisting of three types, which Dr. Lasker judged similar to three stages posited by Western contemporary theories of ego development. Parallels were also noted by Dr. White, between the Indian guna and the Japanese hara. These observations led to further comparisons among the U. S., Japan, and India on issues of: the unit of potential, identity, the role of ritual, definitions of self, defense structures, and responsibility.

While use of field-particle metaphor continued, its limits were more keenly felt. In discussions with Dr. Ramanujam, Ms. Tanuichi noted that the categories that we, as Westerners, choose to compare cultures bring out the similarities between Japan and India while setting our own culture in the position of being unique and unusual. Degree of similarity between cultures depends upon choice of comparative categories, and members of a given culture may tend to choose those along which theirs is discrepant. Along these lines, Dr. Ramanujam noted that we characterize India as a society in which individuals conform to prescribed values and rules of behavior, in opposition to the West, where people strive to develop their own values and follow individually determined rules. Yet, we overlook basic underlying values in the Western culture to which each individual conforms. As Professor Fei had noted, there are important basic similarities among Americans (e. g. placing much value on self-sufficiency and individual choice),

although Americans prefer instead to concentrate on their diversity. Dr. Ramanujam noted that going to the countryside on sunny weekends could be fairly considered as compelling a conformist ritual in the U. S. as religious rituals in India. Such discussions with foreign scholars, along with Ms. Pollak's work on the history of Western notions, allowed Project members to make more explicit and self-conscious use of the informal "American case." A workshop on the goals and practices of American education was scheduled for the Summer of 1980.

Dr. Gardner's work on different kinds of minds, or competencies, was enriched by cross-cultural discussions of forms of meaning-making and of the diversity of valued behaviors and goals. It was clear from the cross-cultural discussions that intellectual accomplishment is not valued as an end in itself in all cultures. What we call intelligence in the West may very well underlie competent performance in various roles (e. g. parenting, political leadership) or may be a prerequisite for achieving explicitly valued goals (e. g., supporting a large family), but intelligence may not be a principal yardstick along which individuals in other cultures are measured. If cognitive science is to be cross-culturally valid, Dr. Gardner reasoned, it must posit a broader notion of human intelligence than that measured in the West in schools with paper-and-pencil tests.

Professor Scheffler's reconceptualization of potential as a second-order capacity -- a capacity to develop capacities -- provided for interdisciplinary dialogue with Ms. McConnell, who was studying the biological forces and constraints of development, and with Dr. Lasker who was concerned with models of development over the life course. In December of 1980, Professor Scheffler incorporated his earlier insights about the context dependency of potential and its second-order, developmental nature into a chain model of development, whereby a particular stage of development interacts with various conditions (societal, psychological, economic, etc.) to produce the next stage of development. That next stage is one of many possible developmental outcomes which is determined by contextual features. Professor Scheffler's chain model of development appealed to Dr. Lasker, who was attempting to formulate a "systems" model of development drawing on current research in the area of adult development.

In Forum discussions of his chain model, Professor Scheffler argued against any model of the realization of potential which would judge particular end-states <u>a priori</u> as normal or deviational (e. g. the acorn becoming a tree is normal; the acorn becoming food for a squirrel is deviational). This motivated Ms. McConnell to follow up her study of neurological development with an examination of developmental processes which appear to be biologically

directed or "canalized."

Discussions at the Forum and within the cross-cultural group on case study topics led to the choice of "teaching and learning" rather than literacy as a primary synthetic category. Professor LeVine and Dr. White feared that the richness of literature on literacy might draw the Project away from some of the topics which were proving most useful in the case studies, e. g. the varied definitions of self, based on familial ties and organizational, spiritual and political ideology; women's lives and child-rearing; healing; the impact of the introduction of Western models of teaching in traditional societies; and, most generally, the relationship between behavior and underlying assumptions and beliefs.

D. Project-Foundation Dialogue: The Scientific Focus

In November of 1980, Dr. Welling visited the Project with his colleague Sir Hugh Springer, former Secretary General of the Association of Commonwealth Universities. Both men felt that the Project should concentrate on the writing of "scientific briefs," and that we should write to our natural audience. There was no need, they felt, for us to write in the policy maker's language or to provide answers for policy maker's questions. If we raise important questions in our scientific work, this generation of policy

makers, or the next, will benefit from our work. While it would be desirable at some point to summarize and draw implications from our work, Dr. Welling and Sir Hugh both felt that our concern for our audience and for achieving early synthesis was hampering our scientific progress.

Dr. Welling was pleased with the international activities of the Project and hoped to see them expand. He invited Dr. Lasker to meet with other members of the Foundation's international network at a conference in Zimbabwe, entitled "Integrated and Early Childhood Education: Preparation for Social Development." He approved of our plan to hold a number of case study workshops in other parts of the world rather than holding one large international conference. And he urged that we establish a large group of international advisors from a variety of fields and cultures, in addition to the small domestic advisory board which we were planning to bring to the Project for occasional site visits.

Dr. Welling asked that an African case study be added. This was agreed upon, although it caused some concern over Project resources. Some discussion followed about the need in our case studies to employ an organizing framework or common template without jeopardizing the emergence of rich ethnopsychological portraits of each case study country. Professor LeVine explained that comparative categories must,

and will be, adjusted as case studies are developed and compared; the quests for the unique and the universal must be simultaneous.

D. Continued Research

1. The Scientific Briefs

Although the exact form and number of volumes to be produced was at this time undecided, the Project Principals set February of 1981 as a deadline for development of individual "briefs" which would outline the basic arguments to be further developed in later Project writing. These briefs, along with other working papers and notes were sent to the Foundation as an optional mid-year report.

Dr. Lasker's brief represented a reworking and expansion of the draft he had prepared in August of 1980. In his brief he brought together two strands of research: Jane Loevinger's theory of ego stage development, which formed the cornerstone of the emerging field of adult development in the West, and the early findings of the Project's cross-cultural research. Dr. Lasker argued that while Loevinger's ego stages may not be cross-culturally valid, a universal theory of ego-stage development may, in fact, be possible. Loevinger's theory would then provide a "phenotypic" account of ego-stage development; the theory to be developed would describe the

"genotype," or underlying mechanisms of ego-stage development. Dr. Lasker proposed to identify genotypic developmental milestones which would manifest themselves differently in field and particle societies. His initial attempt to find evidence for a universal theory of ego-stage development would consist of a comparative study of his own American ego-stage data and an ego-stage text written by a number of professors from Keio University in Tokyo.

Dr. Gardner's brief "Toward a More Universal Study of Human Cognitive Development" sketched the main arguments which were later developed in his Project volume, Frames of Mind. His scientific goal was to broaden and enrich cognitive development theory to identify its biological bases, to incorporate observations and findings from other cultures, and to develop his notion of a multiplicity of forms of intelligence. In this paper he proposed as a possible list of such intelligences the seven intelligences which were later described in Frames of Mind,[2] and he indicated what kinds of arguments he would make to support their existence as "natural kinds" of intelligence. These arguments would be drawn from the evolutionary and biological

2. In the brief, these intelligences were: linguistic, musical, logical, mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, visual-spatial, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. The visual-spatial intelligence would be called spatial in Frames of Mind to free it from connection with a sensory modality: the blind can exhibit spatial intelligence.

sciences, as well as from psychology, and would draw upon cross-cultural data which suggests that different profiles of intelligences are promoted in different cultural settings.

Professor LeVine contributed three papers to the February report which represented some of the major topics and arguments to be incorporated in his Project writing. The first, "The Social Conditions of Child Development" (described above), discussed four trends in the last century which have influenced concepts of child development. In the second paper, "Statement for Workshop on the Anthropology of Human Fertility," he elaborated on the historical trend toward "child-centeredness" with reference to its demographic, economic and psychological aspects. In the third paper, "Cultural Variations in Ethnopsychology: Preliminary Notes," Professor LeVine described five points of ethnopsychological contrast he has found in literature comparing modern Western societies to agrarian societies. Respectively, those contrasts are between: 1) behavior which maintains personal consistency vs. behavior which responds to situations; 2) direct, frank communication vs. diplomatic communication; 3) individual vs. cooperative achievement; 4) intelligence defined apart from social relations vs. socially-defined competence; and 5) promotion of early flowering vs. late flowering of intelligence. Professor LeVine urged that these broad contrasts (like the

field-particle distinction) be used, not to promote stereotypes, but, rather, as starting points for discussions of cultural variation. Through the Project's case studies, these comparative descriptions would be refined and would also be expanded to include ethnopsychological descriptions of the literate cultures in Asia and Latin America.

Professor Scheffler's brief, "Pondering Potentiality" distinguished between two uses, or interpretations of potential statements. Potential statements, on the capacity interpretation, assert a second-order capacity: the capacity to acquire a capacity. For instance, if we assert that John is a potential swimmer, the assertion would be interpreted to mean that John cannot now swim but there are no known preventative circumstances which would preclude his acquiring the capacity to swim. The second, predictive interpretation of potential statements, comes into play in an assertion like "John is a potential heart attack victim." This kind of statement seems to say more than that a particular outcome is possible. It attributes a propensity. Professor Scheffler's brief also included a description of the chain model of development (described above) which applies to both active training and a more "hands off" environment.

The February report also included the working papers "History of Ideas of Human Perfectibility, Utopia and Progress," by Ms. Pollak and "The Effects of Early Experience

on the Brain" by Ms. McConnell. In response to Dr. Welling's desire to keep informed of our progress in the case studies, Dr. White contributed a paper, "The Case Studies: Procedures and Networks."

2. Progress in the Case Studies

a. Teaching and Learning as a Central Theme

"Teaching and learning" became a central theme, integrating the separate strands of Project research and providing focus for the individual case studies. Professor LeVine presented the case for "teaching and learning" as a central theme at Forum:

1) It can be construed broadly (as opposed, e.g., to schooling or literacy) to include the family context.

2) Both formal and informal teaching and learning can be analyzed ethnopsychologically to reveal indigenous theories of development.

3) There exists illuminating documentation of teaching and learning in different historical periods and different cultures.

4) Particular attention to traditional forms of teaching and learning would illuminate the costs, as well as the benefits of importing Western schooling where traditional forms of schooling exist.

Initial discussions of traditional schooling focussed on: Qu'ranic education in the Middle East, the terakoya (temple school) and other schools in pre-modern Japan,

traditional Confucian schools in China, the gurukula (temple school) in India, medieval church schools in Europe, and traditional Jewish education in Europe.

Similarities among these schools were noted by Professor LeVine:

1) They began as religious schools;

2) Learning focussed on sacred or ethical texts, and involved oral recitation and "chanting." Every acquaintance with the text was valued, whether accompanied by understanding or not;

3) Students were males, often those of elite sectors of society;

4) Learning was organized around a "master-disciple" relationship;

5) Pupils were usually not age-graded;

6) While pupils were not age-graded, there were graded levels of attainment;

7) There was an accommodation to pluralism, which provided alternatives for those who did not proceed on a scholarly path; and

8) There exist descriptions of the process of learning which tie what is being learned to a larger framework of moral, spiritual, and philosophical significance.

In the cross-cultural exploration of traditional schooling, there would be no attempt to romanticize tradition, or to weight the past against the present. The object of the study would be to promote understanding of the contexts for the realization of potential, and in doing so, to note that Western theories of education are but <u>one</u>

formulation of the possible paths.

In response to the adoption of teaching and learning as a central theme, Dr. Gardner turned his attention to the manner in which cognitive abilities and forms of learning may evolve and be employed in different cultural contexts. He identified four modes of the transmission of knowledge which may occur differently in different cultures:

1. Virtually biological forms of transmission. These include simple imitation and modelling, as are found in non-human primate and other mammalian societies, and are carried out spontaneously by young children.

2. Steps or levels of mastery. This is the mode of transmission of survival skills or arts/crafts skills, in which there exists a series of steps en route to mastery through which one must pass. Such transmission typically occurs in a workshop or atelier and involves a close bond between novice and master.

3. Traditional schooling. Traditional schools, perhaps growing out of the master/apprentice relationship, set out to teach a literacy or notational system, usually for religious purposes.

4. Modern technological schooling. This typically involves mastery of decontextualized skills or subjects (e. g., history or math). Such schools are secularly-oriented, use texts, and do not presuppose any bond between teacher and learner.

Dr. Gardner devised the notion of "cultural amplifiers," ways in which cultures differentially emphasize aspects of cognitive development and mastery and noted that this perspective would help in analyzing how international development agencies succeed or fail in implementing programs

of education.

b. Workshop on American Education

On June 24, 1981, the Project held a workshop entitled "Goals and Practices of American Education." The purpose of this workshop was to make the American case more explicit with particular emphasis on teaching and learning. Because Americans tend to view education in the perspective of formal schooling, the workshop took schooling as its focus (as opposed to, e. g., early child-rearing, occupational training, or life-long learning). Among the participants in the workshop were: Dr. Catherine Lutz, social anthropologist, Dr. Suzy Groden, former Project member and teacher of writing, Mr. Michael Fultz and Mr. Paul Fulton, doctoral students in human development, and Project members Dr. Lasker, Dr. White, Ms. Taniuchi, and Ms. Pollak.

The discussion was wide-ranging and touched upon goals of learning in general, on moral and spiritual education, on interpersonal relationships (teacher-student; peer), and on links between the educational system and society.

Dr. Groden noted that Americans believe it important to teach children to "think for themselves." Others noted that behind the slogan, the real goal is to teach students to think in certain ways, and to think about what schools

consider important. Arguing in a certain way, problem-solving, and "discovery" are valued, while, as Mr. Fulton noted, other types of thinking, e.g., aesthetic creation, non-analytic thinking and contemplation are ignored. Dr. Lutz described the folk definition of intelligence in America as involving the ability to solve pragmatic problems, to separate fact and feeling, and to phrase ideas abstractly. Strong emotions concerning the subjects of academic inquiry are discouraged. Mr. Fultz observed that such sloganistic and abstract goals as "teaching people to think" are highly adaptive because, in our pluralistic society, it is difficult to achieve consensus on the specific content of what students should be taught to think. Thus, use of such slogans allows for a broader base of support for educational policies. Dr. Lutz agreed, noting that American folk psychology supports a distinction between process and content. This promotes the belief that students can be taught the process of thinking, without the encumbrance of possible unsuitable content.

Dr. White noted that interpersonal skills, and personal moral characteristics are valued outside of school, but moral and spiritual training are not explicitly incorporated into school curriculum.

Mr. Fulton noted that a prevalent view of morality sees reponsibility as residing within the system or the market,

rather than within individual behavior. If the market or technology can be perfected, most moral problems will be solved because each person working for his or her own interests will result in the well-being of all. Responsibility for the morality of the actions of a given organization rests not with the individuals who participate, but with the head of the institution. Unfortunately, these heads typically have little propensity for or experience in dealing with moral issues, and the moral decisions are typically left unmade. Mr. Fulton observed that although historically, natural science once included ethical inquiry, our culture has no science of the person on which to base a moral curriculum or with which to guide moral decisions.

Dr. Lutz remarked that students are assumed to learn academic subjects primarily in hierarchical relationships, not from each other, and each student's primary task is to concentrate on his or her own learning. Outside of class time, however, peer relationships assume major importance. This is especially true in the junior high and high school, where the student body is composed of large numbers of somewhat exclusionary friendship cliques, each of which are assigned a mutually agreed upon, approximate prestige ranking. Students gain a substantial portion of their identity from membership in these cliques.

Mr. Fultz observed that despite current nostalgic

misconceptions, early rural schooling was often based upon a punitive relationship between teacher and student. The teacher, however, was a respected member of the community and served as an ethical guide. The removal of moral training from the classroom has effaced this role as authority and guide in matters other than course content. Currently, teachers act as "communication technicians" whose job is to transfer certain subject matter and information to the young.

Dr. White noted that, in America, in contrast to Japan, obligation and indebtedness do not characterize the teacher-student relationship. Beyond the respectful behavior that students are expected to accord all adults, teachers warrant no special obligation beyond their promised salary for their efforts on behalf of the students. Teachers rarely feel a strong obligation to the students other than to present information during the hours of the day specified in their contract. A personal and reciprocal relationship between teacher and student centering upon the exchange of knowledge rarely occurs and feelings of indebtedness are usually avoided.

c. Japan

The first meeting with our Japanese colleagues, the "Workshop on United States and Japanese Perspectives on Potential," was held at Harvard July 15-21, 1981. This

series of meetings included Dr. Akira Hoshino, Dr. Shigefumi Nagano and Ms. Michiko Fukazawa as representatives from the Japanese team, and several observers representing counterpart disciplines and perspectives from India and the U. S. The inclusion of members of our Indian case study group, Dr. B. K. Ramanujam and Dr. Alan Roland, was intended to provide an alternative non-Western perspective on issues of the self and society. Other local Japan experts included Dr. Mikihachiro Tatara, Mr. Munenichi Inoue, Dr. Dorinne Kondo, Ms. Suzanne Vogel and Ms. Victoria Suzuki. All Project members also took part.

An introductory session was followed by individual presentations by participants and the remaining three days were spent in working groups. These groups focussed on the following topics:

1. Potential in organizations
2. Potential over the life course
3. Teaching and learning in Japan
4. Healing and adult change

During the course of the meeting, several proposals were made for ongoing inquiries and writing to be produced by the Japanese team. Dr. Hoshino suggested that they pursue three lines of study in investigating Japanese conceptions of human potential: cultural, organizational, and individual. In the

first, traditional teaching and learning would be treated. The second would focus on business and school environments and the third would consider the life course of the individual, using lives of individuals from many different fields. Particular emphasis would be placed on the influence of schooling, and the role of family and other identity-conferring contexts. A list of future investigators was established including those present as well as Dr. Sumiko Iwao, Dr. Eishun Hamaguchi and Dr. Yuichi Yamada.

In discussions, several interesting comparative points were made. First, an alternative to Lasker's "field and particle" model for the Japanese self was proposed by Dr. Hoshino, in which he refined Dr. Lasker's model to state that the Japanese self has both an individual ego and deep interconnections with the selves of others. What are crucial in a comparative framework are the boundaries between ego and the collective group. The nature and permeability of these boundaries need examination.

Ms. Fukazawa discussed Japanese relationships and individual vs. social identity, using examples from her clinical practice. Pathologies, both social and individual, were also discussed.

Dr. Nagano outlined the cultural determinants and markers of stages on the life course, and the meanings of

maturity in Japan.

The working groups treated identity within the contexts of the family, schools, and the workplace. In contemporary Japan, potential implies a generalized ability which is developed to a greater or lesser degree in individuals; schools and universities are geared to producing non-specialists. Valued skills and attributes include: social abilities; the absorption of large amounts of information; diligence; persistence and forbearance; and whole-heartedness. Prerequisites for development are a willing and good "head"; good luck; hard work; good parents; and a good environment. Striving is more important than innate ability. What is called "moral education" encourages the development of qualities such as diligence and endurance in the individual. The importance of kuro, or hardship, as part of the learning process was stressed. Ability which comes easily is mistrusted; geniuses are not valued in the same way as people who have struggled.

A presentation of the historical evolution of Japanese ideas of personal development raised the point that there is no "moment in time" which can properly be seized as representing any culture's attitudes and values: even "traditional" societies have experienced frequent historical change.

d. India

Dr. White's meetings in India in January of 1981 led to the formation of a correspondent group which would be assembled for a preliminary workshop in September of 1981. While plans for this meeting were in progress, the Project continued to benefit from regular meetings with Dr. B.K. Ramanujam, who served not only as an advisor on the Indian case, but also as a general advisor on the case studies. He contrasted traditional schooling in India with Western schooling, and discussed some of the problems created by the introduction into traditional societies of formal Western schooling. One such problem is that alternative sources of self-esteem which are available in a more pluralistic traditional learning environment are not available within the Western environment in which students compete publicly along a single measure of accomplishment. Having to face failure creates family tensions.

Dr. Ramanujam also discussed the intimacy between student and teacher which is characteristic of traditional learning in India. He sought to refine and enrich our characterizations of types of societies by contrasting the meanings of dependence in India and Japan, two "field societies." In India, intimacy always surrounds dependency; whereas, in Japan, there are, he argued, besides the intimate dependency of the mother-child relationship, other

relationships where formality and distance characterize the dependency nexus. In the Indian case, the dependency of the weaker person is expected and welcomed by the stronger one, who in turn, has a feeling of elevation. The Japanese, in contrast, seek to limit dependence in relationships outside of the family because of the frequent frustration that the dependent person experiences. "Symbiotic reciprocity" best describes Indian dependency. "Role dependency" might best describe the more formal Japanese kind. This is not to say that there is no reciprocity in the Japanese case. In fact, the mutuality of obligation is explicitly recognized in a relationship, both immediately and in terms of very long-term trade-offs in a relationship. However, the subtle and conscious calculations which are made in the Japanese case do not contribute towards a sense of merging which occurs in the Indian case. Japanese mutuality implies distance, and the time frame for the working out of dependency obligations is the life span of one particular relationship, while in India, intimacy implies merger and the time frame extends far beyond one's own life or even the life of one's descendants. In considering "repayment" then, the Hindu householder sees past and future lives across a wide variety of social environments, while the Japanese sees himself, his immediate family, and perhaps one generation of descendants as crucially involved.

Dr. Ramanujam also helped us to initiate our "Teaching

and Learning" focus with discussions of the relationship between guru and disciple and the stages of development which are recognized and promoted in the student through this relationship.

e. China

Correspondence continued between our Project and the Rencai group. Plans were made to coordinate a trip to China with the Japanese workshop to be held in Tokyo in 1982.

f. Colombia

At the van Leer meetings in Zimbabwe, Dr. Lasker made contact with a Colombian scholar, Dr. Marta Arango of CINDE (Centro International de Educacion y Desarrollo Humano). Immediately upon Dr. Lasker's return, the Project began to develop plans for a Colombian case study to replace the Mexican case study which, due to Dr. Corona's complex schedule, had to be abandoned. Dr. Arango and her husband, Dr. Glen Nimnicht, paid a visit to the Project in April, 1981, to discuss plans for the study. A tentative work schedule was drawn up at that time. A month later, Professor LeVine traveled to Colombia to assemble a correspondent group, with the help of Drs. Arango and Nimnicht, who would act as coordinators. Professor LeVine met with a number of scholars, as potential members of the correspondent group,

including Francisco Cobos, Magdalena Leon de Leal, Aracelly de Tezanno, and Carlos Eduardo Vasco.

g. Egypt

In April of 1981, our principal Egyptian correspondents, Drs. Nawal and Asaad Nadim, visited the Project to discuss the Egyptian case. Dr. Asaad Nadim discussed master-apprentice relationships and Dr. Nawal Nadim discussed the ethnopsychology of traditional urban women. During that visit and through subsequent correpondence, topics, participants, and dates were set for a workshop to be held in Cairo in November of 1981. (Following President Sadat's assassination, the workshop was postponed to January 1981.)

h. Africa

Detailed planning for an African case study awaited Dr. Welling's visit to the Project in July. Prior to that visit, however, it was decided that the African case study might best represent a region rather than a country. West Africa was tentatively chosen as a region in which cultural unity prevails across political boundaries and from which a diverse group of scholars could be assembled to form a correspondent group.

F. Intra-project Dialogue: Questions of Development

At the urging of Dr. Welling and Sir Hugh, much of the work of the second year consisted of developing the basic arguments to be made in the Project's manuscripts. By the Spring of 1981 each Project Principal had had the opportunity to discuss at Forum, and further develop, the February "briefs."

Professor Scheffler added a third interpretation of potential statements to his philosophical analysis, the decisional interpretation (DI). On the capacity interpretation (CI), we assert a possibility: a capacity to develop a capacity. On the predictive interpretation (PI), we assert a propensity, i. e. the potential is likely to be realized unless the relevant circumstances are altered. On the third interpretation the relevant condition is decisional, i. e. if potential is denied, it is due to lack of effectiveness of the agents own decision or choice. Thus the developmental process at issue is self-developmental. Highlighting issues of choice and self-development raised questions of cross-cultural validity. Are these issues primarily of concern in "particle societies?" How applicable are they to "field societies?"

Professor Scheffler's response was three-fold. First, self-development applies to any entity, individual or social. To the extent that "field societies" concern themselves with

social goals, decisions must be made, on some level, as to how they are to be achieved. Second, even in the most norm-governed field society the notion of individual choice applies. As our Indian and Chinese consultants argued, norms offer models which individuals choose to employ. Even if free choice is not felt and valued as strongly in these societies as in America, individuals are, in fact, held responsible for deviance and conformity, which betrays an underlying acknowledgement of freedom. Third, to the extent that educational ideology supports the process of the student ultimately outgrowing the need for the teacher (or the developing country outgrowing the need for externally conceived and funded projects) the process of self-development -- of internalizing the realization process -- is crucial.

While Professor Scheffler's work concentrated primarily on issues of individual development in social contexts, Professor LeVine's became increasingly focussed on issues of international development. To the extent that educational interventions make (or shape) decisions for others, Professor LeVine argued, they must be planned with great care. Just as the common Western notions of potential and individual development harbor myths, so do the models of development in different countries. These models tend to be based on economic theories of development and to assume that the processes through which developed countries achieved

modernization (e. g. industrialization and mass schooling) are the processes which must be promoted in underdeveloped countries. Professor LeVine urged that these assumptions underlying educational interventions must be questioned on the basis of evidence concerning cultural beliefs, values and institutions. He noted that it is often taken for granted, for example, that personal satisfaction and fulfillment are a function of wealth, that individuals seek satisfaction in the same resources and activities the world over, that individual autonomy is the most desirable context for social adaptation, that competence is reducible to its intellectual component, and that childhood is the critical period for the maturation of capacities.

Dr. Lasker viewed his own work on ego-stage theories, which posit an over-arching ego function, as speaking to Professor Scheffler's concern for the decisional, or self-developmental aspect of the realization of potential. He argued that it is on the level of ego function that the talents described in Dr. Gardner's work are managed. Advancing ego-stage levels empower the individual to utilize such talents. Drs. Lasker and Gardner took opposite perspectives on the life cycle and disagreed about the existence of a general managing capacity. Also, Dr. Lasker viewed development as enhancing options, as empowering the individual, while Dr. Gardner's more biologically-oriented work highlighted the limitation or foreclosing of options.

While Drs. Lasker and Gardner maintained theoretical differences on the question of the existence of a general capacity, or ego function, their opposing perspectives in viewing potential over the life course contributed to a more comprehensive view of growth and development.

Professor Scheffler's predictive interpretation of potential and his anti-essentialist arguments prompted fruitful research by and discussions with Dr. Gardner and Ms. McConnell. They questioned whether, just as one might be at risk for a disease, one might also be "at promise" for a talent. Ms. McConnell argued that the Western notion of potential as essence is, in part, responsible for the biologist's location of potential in the genes; in biological thought, development is often seen as the unfolding of genetic essence. Her survey of literature on species-typical development suggested that the environmental events that have been seen as merely supporting developmental outcomes are, in fact, constructing these outcomes in tandem with the genes. Outcomes that are seen as universal, e. g. language use, are in fact "environment-expectant." That is, evolution has selected genes that expect certain environmental interactions to occur, and these dependable interactions result in the species-typical development. Where environmental interactions are predictable the developmental path is often-termed "genetic" or "innate." These discussions, and Dr. Gardner's continued elaboration on the theory of multiple

intelligences, brought out the complexity of nature/nurture issues.

G. Evaluation and Planning: Utilizing Advisors and Networks

1. Outreach

By the Spring of 1981, the scientific work of the Project was well underway. Each Project Principal had developed a "brief" and each was comfortable with the chosen topic for synthesis (teaching and learning) and with the theoretical framework sketched by Professor Scheffler. It was time to go "semi-public," to subject the progress and ideas of the Project to the scrutiny of colleagues and other members of our target audience. While we had had some fruitful contact with correpondents through the Foundation's network in the first year, testing out our general approach, it wasn't until our "first draft" knowledge had been articulated that we could test specific and concrete ideas.

Our first efforts in this area were devoted to the selection of an American advisory board which would read Project documents and meet at the Project at least twice. The search for "border scholars" of another type was activated: we sought to involve scholars who were familiar with our fields of expertise, but who would be able to offer

new perspectives as well. After much discussion about "border" qualifications and about the need to assemble a broad, representative group, eight members were chosen. Their names and fields are listed in Appendix A. Five of the eight members (Drs. Altbach, Geschwind, Green, Neugarten, and Bane) were able to convene in early June. At that meeting, the Project Principals summarized their current thinking and responded to questions, suggestions and criticism.

Professor Scheffler introduced the chain model of development and the notion of potential as a second order capacity; a capacity to develop a capacity. Dr. Geschwind argued that this leads to an infinite regress; a previous capacity is required to explain the first, and then another to explain that, and so on. This problem, he claimed, could only be solved by resorting to essentialism or by appeal to biology. Biology, he argued, is understandable in terms of genes, enzymes, and other such manipulable entities. It can liberate Professor Scheffler's theory from reliance on mysterious essences.

In response, Professor Scheffler clarified his view. The initial capacity is defined in terms of the current state of the person. This incorporates both biology and culture. He did not intend that biological factors be seen, a priori, as constraining or liberating. He agreed with Dr. Geschwind that, in some cases, biological factors may prove more

manipulable than cultural factors.

Dr. Geschwind urged that the Project continue its examination of the implications for human potential of biological studies. He illustrated the relevance of biological knowledge to policymaking with examples of biologically determined critical periods for learning.

Much of the discussion following the other presentations by Project Principals concerned questions of audience and goals. Professor Altbach felt that we should first achieve greater integration of the different aspects of our work, then present that integrated work to a general audience. Only in the final phase of the Project should we concern ourselves with the specific needs of the policymaker.

Dr. Neugarten agreed that we should not address policymakers prematurely, but suggested that we conduct a study of a single policy problem (e.g., urban migration) as a test of our theoretical framework. Dr. Green suggested that we might take as our goal to change the rhetoric used in international development circles. This, he felt, would eventually lead to shifts in program design.

Dr. Bane felt that it was not too early to concern ourselves with policy issues, and urged that we expand our staff to include someone with expertise and experience in

international development, perhaps someone who could represent the "human capital" approach. She made specific suggestions of questions to ask policy makers: What are the important policy decisions of the near future? How can our work contribute to informed allocation of resources among different sorts of capacities, ages, and barriers to realization? She suggested that we examine the "human capital" movement in international development.

While we were in the final stages of planning the meeting of the American board, Dr. Welling expressed concern that our advisory board be composed of scholars representing diverse cultures and fields of expertise. Our plan had been to use the American board for regular site visits, and international advisors, readers, and correspondents (including our case-study correspondents) in a less formal and more individual manner. Dr. Welling felt that the bringing together of an international board would be beneficial and worked with us to develop a list of possible members and to establish a schedule for one or two meetings. Over the subsequent months, it was agreed that while it was imperative that we seek reactions to our work from a diverse group of international scholars, those scholars could be involved in a variety of capacities. This less formal definition of "Project Advisor" carried over to the American group. Aside from a follow-up meeting with two American Board members who were unable to attend the June meeting, no

further group meetings were scheduled, yet effective contact with a variety of readers and correspondents was maintained.

In July of 1981, Dr. Gardner traveled to Europe and Africa to discuss the "first draft" findings of the Project with several international correspondents including Professor Wall and Dr. Welling in the Hague, Nawal and Asaad Nadim in Cairo, Norberto Bottani, Ladislaw Cerych and Claude Lèvi-Strauss in Paris. He also attended a conference on neural plasticity in Tunisia.

2. Project-Foundation Dialogue

One of the Project's advisors was the man whose challenge in 1978 led to the birth of the Project, Oscar van Leer. In June of 1981, Mr. van Leer visited the Project to learn of its progress and to offer guidance. The meeting began with Professor Scheffler's presentation of his three interpretations of potential and his chain model of development. Mr. van Leer questioned whether Professor Scheffler's analysis emphasized contextual features at the expense of features of the skill itself which resides in "essential" elemental forms in the individual with potential. For example, he argued, the potential musician displays elements (e. g., pitch and rhythm) of the skill to be developed. Professor Scheffler countered that while one can promote apparent potential, as in the case of the musician,

one can also uncover hidden potential; elemental skills can often be developed if one is willing to invest resources.

Dr. Gardner's emerging theory of multiple intelligences spoke to Mr. van Leer's interest in the basic or essential elements of skills. Dr. Gardner described the seven basic intellectual competences posited by his emerging theory: linguistic, logical/mathematical, musical, visual/spatial, bodily/kinesthetic, social/interpersonal, and intrapersonal (knowledge of self). Raw abilities in these domains, Dr. Gardner argued, reflect the structure of the nervous system. Individuals may differ in the ease with which they develop skills in these areas; the child with a sense of pitch and rhythm would certainly require less training in music to develop his potentials, than the child without these gifts.

Mr. van Leer noted that man has, throughout history, sought to discover the fundamental, irreducible elements. Would Dr. Gardner's seven intelligences withstand the test of time? Dr. Gardner replied that the evidence supporting the existence of these seven intelligences is drawn largely from biological studies. He cautioned, however, that his biological evidence is also drawn largely from Western populations. To claim cross-cultural validity would require cross-cultural study, for example, of brain-damaged individuals, of <u>idiot savants</u>, and of prodigies.

Dr. Lasker's presentation of the field/particle metaphor prompted Mr. van Leer to question whether we might be exaggerating cultural differences. In physics, the particle and wave apply to the same subject. While a particular culture's self-image may encourage one perspective or the other, the difference is more a matter of perspective than of reality. Dr. Lasker agreed that at this time we are, in fact, consciously exaggerating differences in order to highlight the forms of selfhood found in different cultures, and to raise important questions of transferability of techniques and forms of organization.

Mr. van Leer was favorably impressed with the progress of the Project. He was concerned, however, that the Project was spreading itself too thin in its cross-cultural work. He argued that we need not examine so many cases to avoid ethnocentrism. One needs only to acknowledge the relativity of perspectives, he argued, employing an analogy of the coin which can be viewed as a line, an ellipse, or a circle.

In July of 1981 Dr. Welling and his Director of Scientific Research, Professor W. D. Wall, visited the Project for a series of meetings. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss Project progress to date and to establish a work plan and budget for the remaining years of the Project.

Professor Wall heard Project presentations and offered both specific comments and general advice. Like Sir Hugh Springer, Professor Wall felt that we ought not force synthesis. He expressed confidence that our work, even if it lacked total theoretical convergence, would be of use to policy makers. However, he advised that we clearly identify our areas of convergence and non-convergence. In response to a presentation of our cross-cultural work, he urged that we distinguish between ideas people have about themselves -- the ideals and "folk theories" -- and the "real psychology" underlying their actual behavior.

Dr. Welling noted that we had achieved substantial conceptual unity since his last visit, and judged that we were now ready to address our work more directly to policy makers. The recent shift in the Foundation toward a more programmatic funding strategy, which would focus on the 0-7 age group, reinforced the need for clarity of thought on issues of development in different cultural contexts. Professor Wall and Dr. Welling both felt that the Foundation would benefit from our work in facing the challenge of determining how indigenous patterns can be used as the basis for innovation, rather than being threatened by it. Our recent focus on indigenous schooling was thus in concert with the Foundation's new programmatic thrust.

This series of meetings ended with detailed discussions

of the means by which the Project's thinking would be made public. Dr. Welling turned his attention to questions of the number, form, and content of our published products, and to designing a work plan for the production of those products. He proposed that the Project publish three volumes: Volume I, the "synthetic" volume, would be co-authored by the Project Principals after Volumes II and III were drafted. The Foundation, in consultation with the Project would draft two parts of Volume I, addressing policy makers and practitioners respectively. Volume II would be drafted by Dr. Gardner and would represent the Project's interdisciplinary research. Volume III would be drafted by Professor LeVine and Drs. White and Lasker, and would represent the Project's cross-cultural work. In addition, the Project intended to produce a fourth volume consisting of collected papers from the case study workshops. The planning of this volume awaited completion of the case studies in Year Four.

Dr. Welling agreed with the Project Principals' judgement that these writing objectives would require a six-month extension of the Project. He agreed to support a request for additional funds which would indicate cost-cutting as well as cost-extending modifications to the work plan. Also included in the revised budget would be funds for an African case study and for meetings with international advisors. The second year of the Project ended

with the preparation of a revised work plan and budget to be submitted to the Foundation for approval.

IV. Year Three: Volumes Defined, Case Studies to Fruition

A. Overview

By the beginning of the third year of the Project, consensus had been achieved on the form and number of Project volumes, and on the major activities to be planned and carried out. The work plan and budget, extending the Project until February of 1984, had been accepted by the Foundation.

Professor Scheffler played a central role in the discussions and drafting of Volume I, the synthetic volume, which was originally conceived of as a co-authored volume, but which, for reasons discussed below, would become his own volume written from a philosophical perspective.

Mr. Gardner immediately began drafting his volume, Volume II, which would review evidence on cross-cultural, biological, and developmental investigations of human cognition, and would present an integrated theory of the development and deployment of multiple forms of human intelligence.

Professor LeVine and Drs. White and Lasker began outlining, and drafting, sections of Volume III, the cross-cultural volume. The drafting of major sections of

Volume III awaited completion of the case studies and further comparative research on issues of teaching and learning. Workshops in India, Egypt, Japan and China were held during the third year, and plans were made for African and Latin American workshops, to be held in the fourth year.

Dr. Lasker's involvement in the writing of Volume III, and later, his involvement in the Project, ended during the course of the third year. By December of 1981, he recognized the need to restructure his role in the Project to accommodate new demands on his time from a burgeoning business venture involving the development of interactive video training systems. From that time through July of 1982, a gradual transition was effected to the sole directorship of Dr. Merry White, who served as Director for the remainder of the Project.

B. Volume I: The Synthetic Volume

1. Scheffler's "Synthetic Sketch"

In the Summer meetings of 1981, Volume I was conceived of as the Project's synthetic, jointly-authored volume, to which the Foundation would add material on implications for policy and practice. The Project's portion of Volume I was to be drafted after major portions of Volume II and III were drafted, to incorporate the conclusions reached in those

volumes. While this ordering of tasks, in theory, made sense, what had proved most effective in spurring progress in all areas of the Project was a more dialectic process between the broad theoretical issues and the more empirical material. For example, some of the biological studies of development were inspired by Professor Scheffler's philosophical concerns about the implicit theories of development underlying common uses of the term potential. And his reconceptualization of potential as relative to resources and value led the cross-cultural group to concern itself with the ethical responsibility borne by those who effect change, and with the models and theories they employ. Discussion of empirical research in the interdisciplinary and cross-cultural groups, in turn, shaped the more philosophical treatment of potential, raising questions, e. g. about "environment expectant" developmental outcomes, and about the cross-cultural validity of educational ideologies emphasizing individual achievement and choice. This process of mutual illumination was to continue as the Project volumes were drafted.

In order to move the Project forward in its work on the synthetic volume, Professor Scheffler offered to write a working paper, a "catalytic" paper, to initiate discussions of the planning and drafting of Volume I. That paper, entitled "Harvard's Potential Project: A Synthetic Sketch," represented a continued elaboration of Professor Scheffler's

philosophical work on human potential with explicit reference to, and interweaving of, the more empirical work of the other Project Principals. Professor Scheffler elaborated on the common notion of potential and its underlying view of humanity:

> Behind . . .use of the notion of potential lies the basic reality that human beings are not constrained in their development as are other animals. Their lives are not bounded by the reach of their instincts and drives, coupled with the opportunities of their physical environments; they do not live in the immediate present alone, responding only to the contemporary forces playing upon them. Human beings are symbolic animals, creators and creatures of culture, capable of memory, imagination, fear and hope, interpreters of the world and of themselves, choosers among options they themselves define, and vulnerable as well to the choices of their fellows. Such interpretations and choices make a fateful difference to the direction and quality of a human life. What the biology of the infant leaves open at birth is, in short, filled out by culture, history, education and decision.
>
> The realization of this fact leads us to think of the particular dependent infant as having an array of possible futures, the selection among which depends in good part upon what we do. Some such futures we may deem intrinsic to the child's nature and thus value as his possible achievements, others we deem foreign to his nature or otherwise unfortunate. We tend then to categorize the former as his potentials and to train all our efforts on their optimal realization. Conversely, an abstractly valuable future we judge to be beyond a given infant's reach is one we need to expend no effort on, and can ignore with an easy conscience if not without regret. Though such ways of thinking are understandable, they are nevertheless in urgent need of critical examination and analysis.

He then explained the need for reconstructing the concept of potential (to expose and correct the myths discussed previously), and the relation of such a reconstruction to the empirical work of the Project:

> The [reconstructive] task will serve to guide the empirical task by providing a conceptual framework for factual description. On the other hand, the empirical task will at the same time serve to control the analytical reconstruction by testing its adequacy to incorporate all the content we deem available and significant. Thus the analytical reconstruction is not proposed dogmatically; it is a guiding hypothesis to facilitate the empirical work, channeling the way such work is conceived and executed, yet subject to further revision as a result of such execution itself.
>
> What we hope for as a general outcome of both tasks is an illumination of educational decision-making, insofar especially as it depends on assumptions about the possibilities and prospects of human development. We conceive of such illumination as involving both a clearer grasp of the logical structure of educational decision-making and an empirically informed view of the psychological and cultural factors pertinent to such decision-making. In sum, we strive to improve the conceptual apparatus and the knowledge base required for the decision-maker's tasks.

Some of the empirical issues and evidence that Professor Scheffler aimed to accommodate in his analytic work included biological findings, e. g. some cortical neurons become committed with age to certain functions (and thus, some potentials may be closed or opened by biological development); that some individuals appear to be "at promise" for a talent just as they may be "at risk" for a disease (i. e. some potentials are actually "propensities"); and that

some cognitive abilities appear to be neurologically canalized, (e. g. language skills that will develop, given half a chance).

Professor Scheffler also aimed to reconceptualize potential to accommodate cross-cultural findings, including those concerning different modes of transmitting knowledge (from biologically-based imitation to formal "decontextualized" schooling) and the ways in which cultures appear to differentially amplify or motivate development of different competencies or intelligences. In addition, he aimed to recast questions of potential to highlight questions raised in the case studies, questions which must be addressed by those who formulate international educational policies. For example: What benefits and costs (social as well as economic) accrue when formal schooling is introduced into traditional societies? How is human potential variously viewed within individualist and collectivist forms of organization? How can the consequences of social change be assessed in terms of satisfaction and suffering? And, finally, how can the success or failure of interventions be anticipated, and evaluated? The Project's case studies, with their new "teaching and learning" focus, would highlight such questions and possible answers, which would, in turn, shape the development of the analytic, reconstructive work.

2. Intraproject Dialogue

Several Forum meetings during the Fall and Winter of 1981 were devoted to discussion of the types of issues raised above, as Volume I took form. Questions of form, focus, scope, audience, and authorship were addressed.

The first question to arise in these discussions was that of boundaries between the Project's presentation of its synthetic framework and the supplemental material to be provided by the Foundation directed specifically to policy makers and practitioners. It was agreed that while we would make no attempt to make specific, detailed recommendations to policy makers, it was within the scope of our function, interest, and competence to draw general implications of our findings for policy makers. These general implications would describe the features of individuals and contexts which must be attended to and understood if interventions are to be responsible and successful.

A number of suggestions were debated in Forum meetings as to the form and focus of Volume I: it might serve as a summary of the findings in the other volumes, in the form of a "popular science" presentation, with a concluding chapter on implications for planning and development; it might be a critique of current concepts of potentials, theories of development, and models of intervention; or, it might present

what Professor Scheffler termed "a practical theory for social policy makers." This third possibility was discussed in detail, and eventually adopted.

This "practical theory" is akin to the "theories" behind professional training in education, medicine, and law. Such theories consist of an interdisciplinary base combined with (at least implicitly) an ideology of goals and ethics. Just as a medical doctor must possess an interdisciplinary knowledge base and good clinical sense (e.g. knowing what to look for and how to interpret it), the social policy maker must work from a broad interdisciplinary knowledge base and know how to use it in practice. And just as the doctor must have a code of ethics, the social policy maker must adopt a conscious, justifiable basis on which he or she evaluates costs and benefits, successes and failures.

Thus, the proposed function of Volume I would be to provide a practical theory which would make recommendations, based on our research, of the kinds of knowledge and theoretical concepts which ought to be included in a curriculum for the training of social policy makers. This plan was consistent with the overall mandate of the Project, and appealed particularly to Professor LeVine, as it would speak directly to two of his major concerns, viz., that social and educational policy currently employs limited models drawn largely from economic theory, and that policy

makers must understand not only the breadth of cultural variation but also its depth. Culture does not represent mere accidental or "decorative" features of a society. Rather, it represents alternative models for human development, its sustaining processes and goals, models which must be understood by those whose policies may disrupt or supplant them. Thus, Professor LeVine viewed a "practical theory" as drawing heavily upon anthropological and sociological findings and incorporating a "code of ethics" which acknowledges the cultural relativity of goals and models of development.

One central dilemma in these discussions was the desire to communicate a positive, innovative formulation of issues of potential without committing ourselves to a universalistic formulation which would fail to be cross-culturally valid. Professor Scheffler was most willing to take a stand on educational ideology, adopting, generally speaking, a Kantian view of human nature which emphasizes rationality and freedom. Professor Scheffler had argued that any program for the realization of human potential is inevitably value-laden. If he were to propose a positive model for planning and evaluating such programs, he must expose and clarify his underlying values.

Professor LeVine argued against the Kantian view of human nature. While Kant might be excused for not taking

into account a wealth of cross-cultural findings, he argued, we cannot and must not be so excused. Kant's "universal" principles do not take into account other systems of ethics, like Confucianism, nor do they explain apparent differences across cultures in experienced need for freedom. Professor Scheffler suggested that false consciousness may account for suppressed desire for freedom. Professor LeVine's inclination was to eschew any a priori formulation of human nature which would label some such needs "false" and others "natural." Each culture, he argued, has its own set of justified constraints which may appear unjustified to those of other cultures. For example, we may force children to practice piano lessons on a sunny day, while Indians force marriage choices, yet in neither culture is deep regret over these constraints suffered.

Professor Scheffler agreed that individual and social progress often involves costs (constraints), and that different cultures weigh those costs differently. But he felt that some constraints are more justifiable than others and that the view of human nature upon which such justification is based is not completely a priori. It is based on experience, but not reducible to it.

This dilemma (a perennial one) was never fully resolved between the two scholars, but it was not allowed to hamper writing progress. It was decided that each Project Principal

would attempt to incorporate the "mutual illumination" gained through the Project into his or her own Volume, but would not feel constrained to represent full consensus. Such a constraint would be likely to result in slow progress and an overly neutral, and ultimately uninteresting, presentation. We thus followed Professor Wall's and Mr. Welling's advice not to force synthesis. Professor Scheffler would write Volume I in consultation with other Project members, but would be solely responsible for its content. Professor LeVine would incorporate his critique of "universal" models of development into Volume III. No attempt would be made to "paper over the cracks" across Project volumes.

By the end of Year Three, Professor Scheffler had outlined Volume I, Of Human Potential. The bulk of the writing of that volume would take place in Year Four.

C. Volume II: Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences

During the third year of the Project, Dr. Gardner, with the help of his research assistants, continued to gather evidence in support of the seven intelligences discussed in his brief. Arguments for the existence of each intelligence as a relatively autonomous mental domain, in which one can progress at different rates, were drawn from neurobiological findings, theories of evolution, and data on prodigies and

idiot savants. Some of the data used to support the theory, in particular that related to symbol systems and artistic competence, were drawn from Dr. Gardner's research at Harvard's Project Zero, carried out over fifteen years. Dr. Gardner's work on brain damage at the Boston Veteran's Administration Medical Center, carried out over ten years, provided much of the biological data used to support arguments for the relatively autonomous functioning of the individual intelligences.

Ms. McConnell's neurobiology papers and the discussions they inspired also found expression in some of the chapters. For instance, in the Summer of 1981, Ms. McConnell prepared a brief paper on tool use in non-human primates, which proved helpful for Dr. Gardner's chapter in bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. This paper examined how tool-using behaviors originated, especially in young animals, and how they are transferred through the social group. Ms. McConnell left the Project in the Fall of 1981 to pursue a PhD in neurobiology at Harvard.

Claudia Strauss, a doctoral student in anthropology, joined Dr. Gardner's research group to assist him in developing material on notions of culturally-defined competencies, and on the implications of the multiple intelligence theory (MI) for education. She attended the cross-cultural Teaching and Learning Seminars (described in

Section D.1.b.) and also facilitated cross-fertilization across the Project Volumes. Her work on the Project culminated in the production of a paper, "Beyond 'Formal' vs. 'Informal' Education." In that paper she argued that the "formal/informal" dichotomy obscures differences among forms of education within each category and exaggerates the discontinuity between forms placed in opposite categories. She proposed instead, a taxonomy of learning strategies and procedures. She then applied that taxonomy to cross-cultural research findings on the cognitive consequences of education. This paper was later published in Ethos (Fall, 1984) and won The Sterling Award from the Society for Psychological Anthropology.

By the end of the third year, Dr. Gardner had drafted all chapters of his volume, and most had been reviewed by his colleagues at the Project. Several other scholars would serve as readers. (See Appendix A).

D. Volume III: LeVine's and White's cross-cultural Volume

The writing of Volume III would draw upon the results of three major strands of research which were still in progress during Year Three. The first was the work of the correspondent groups which was, in Years Three and Four, culminating in meetings and workshops. The second was the

work of the Harvard team and its local advisors on comparative and historical models of teaching and learning. The third, more recent strand of research, was the study of current models of development employed by policy makers, particularly by those involved with international educational development. This research would be drawn upon in the opening chapter of Volume III, which would critique "universal" models of development and thereby motivate the later comparative material on alternative models.

1. Research on Alternative Models

a. the Case Studies

1. India

During its third year, the Project sponsored two meetings of the Indian correspondent group. A planning meeting was held in September of 1981 in Chicago, in conjunction with a workshop on "Life Courses and Family Relationships in Alternative Psychologies of South Asia." All of the Indian group (see Appendix A) except Dr. Erna Hoch were in attendance. Themes and paper topics were established for the Indian workshop to be held in Cambridge in June of 1982.

The June workshop, entitled "Healing, Personal Transformation and the Life Course in India," was attended by Project members and by all members of the Indian group with th exception of Dr. A. K. Ramanujam, who was ill at the time. The papers presented were: "Open Person and Fluid Family," by Professor McKim Marriott; "Grandfathers," by Dr. S. Anandalakshmy; "The Transcendent-Immanent Self: Continuity and Counterpoint to the Familial Self," by Dr. Alan Roland; "Person and Personal Transformation in Tantra," by Dr. Sudhir Kakar; "Attitudes and Expectations with Regard to Health and Healing of Illiterate Mountain Peasants in India," by Dr. Erna Hoch; and "Learning Psychotherapy: A Cultural Perspective," by Dr. Prakash Desai. An abbreviated sampling of some of the ideas discussed in these papers follows.

Professor Marriott's discussion of the Indian family focussed on his concept of "fluidity"; he described the boundaries of families and of individuals as not sharply defined, but created by "flows" between people. Families are flexible; they lack legal roles and responsibilities, and decisions are always reversible. But they operate in a context of dependability, which is valued because it provides continuity for the "flow." Dr. Kakar suggested that an emphasis on fluidity may create a preoccupation, by reaction, with that which is constant, such as Atman, an unmoving point of observation.

In the discussion following Dr. Anadalakshmy's paper, "Grandfathers," family as a context of responsibility, rather than family as a context of emotional attachment was discussed. The uses of biography to analyze personal experience of culture was also discussed. In biography, there is a sense of personal autonomy and control of destiny which is not frequently acknowledged in other records of Indian lives. Dr. Roland noted that in the area of personal transformation, Hindu culture has always afforded a large measure of personal autonomy.

Dr. Roland's paper highlighted the fact that the inner cognitive/emotional structure of Indians is adapted to the hierarchical extended family. The "familial self" is engaged in inner transformation toward the spiritual ideal. Dr. Roland presented the "spiritual" and "familial" selves as aspects of a single self rather than as separate identities. The use of myth in self and societal identities in India was also discussed.

Dr. Kakar discussed the uses of Tantra to realize the self in enlightenment. Jungian and Freudian interpretations of Tantric beliefs were discussed. Tantric denial of the ordinary relationship of the person to the environment was described as favoring a state of attunement to the environment in which one desires (actively) only what the environment is ready to provide. This is explained by a

Bengali engineer who has been a practicing Tantric for over twenty years:

> The true tantrik is always in a state of non-suppression and enjoyment. The purpose of every moment of life is to experience ananda. Ananda is an active enjoyment of everything that comes your way. If there is a heat wave, I will not try to make it less by using a fan or an air conditioner. Nor will I try to put up with the heat by turning my mind away and bearing it in the manner of the stoics. The true tantrik puts himself, or rather is, in a body-mind state where he enjoys the heat. . .Ideally,. . .his desire awakes just at the moment when the environment is willing to grant it. If a woman desires him his desire for her is there; if food awaits him, his appetite is keen.

Kakar declined to evaluate Tantrism's role for the "healthy" person in relation to its counterparts in Western systems of psychotherapy. The Tantric ideal of an androgynous identity, as contrasted with the goal of "true" masculinity or femininity in most Western systems, and the Tantric preparation for an ego receiving the world, as against the Western, Faustian notion of the ego advancing against the world to change it, are not simple right or wrong alternatives. An acquaintance with the Tantric system makes us aware of the existence of a wider range of human potentials than we are normally prepared to acknowledge.

Hoch noted in her presentation that Kashmiri peasants are rarely introspective or self-reflective: They exhibit little awareness of inner processes and little understanding

of reasons for beliefs and actions. She claimed that they also have less capacity for fantasy or for speculation on the past and future. She applied these observations to the context of healing and the relationship of patient to doctor. Discussion focussed on problems of definition and context in considering Hoch's claims. The group emphasized that the ability to be self-reflective, to speculate and fantasize, do exist in every human but that evidence and style are relative and variable.

In his paper, Dr. Desai considered the role and practice of Indian psychotherapy, and differences with American therapy.

The two discussion sessions, on family and healing, produced comments on all the preceding papers relating therapeutic models to basic cultural ideas about the person and interpersonal relationships. Participants emphasized cultural models of the child's socialization (social, emotional, cognitive) within the family. The universality or cultural specificity of needs such as indulgence, praise and frustration in childhood was discussed.

Dr. Anandalakshmy and others discussed models for women's lives, and the treatment of girls within the family. A guest participant, Betty Friedan, also raised the question of models for old age, for men and women, which led to a

discussion of meanings given to death and reincarnation.

Discussions of healing focussed on an Indian paradigm of stress and illness; on the process of becoming a healer; on Ayurvedic medicine; and on ritual and pilgrimage, as part of personal transformation. Dr. B. K. Ramanujam presented his case material and led a discussion of achievement, status and buffering in the family.

The final discussion involved cross-cultural comparison between Japan and India. Topics included: adolescent aggression and parental nurturance, social responsibility and the role of the environment in establishing causal or enactive "powers" affecting a person's potentials, and cultural differences in sponsorship, teaching and mentoring.

2. Egypt

In January of 1982, the Project sponsored a workshop with its correspondent group in Cairo. The Egyptian team gave informal presentations and led discussions on a wide range of topics.

Dr. Roshdy Fam discussed the need for concepts and tools by which different dimensions of human potential might be identified in terms of attitude and perspective. For example: Do Egyptians conceive of potential as achievable by

effort or destined by fate? Do Egyptians feel that males or females have more "potential?" Are Egyptians more past- or more future-oriented? To what degree do Egyptians as individuals see themselves as dependent on others or reliant on themselves? What is the image of the developed person? Addressing questions in terms of the socioeconomic and cultural settings existing in Egypt today would, he argued, indicate the degree of commonality or diversity which exists, and put into perspective Egyptian priorities for development.

Dr. Salah Kotb led a discussion of the educational environment in contemporary Egypt including the redefinitions of the goals of learning, incorporated in the concept of basic education.

Dr. Nawal Nadim discussed socialization and sex roles in Egypt, with particular attention to indigenous definitions of the life course and stages of development. A description of the organization of learning in the context of apprenticeship in the traditional craft of arabesque wood carving was presented by Dr. Asaad Nadim.

Dr. Farag A. Farag gave an overview of the Egyptian context for human potential with reference to social, economic, demographic and cultural data. This led to discussions of implications for programs and policy.

The importance of asynchrony was discussed in the last session, as an underlying theme in the discussion of Egyptian potential. Change occurs at different rates in different domains of the same person's experience. A person might simultaneously live with cultural ideals from tribal, Pharaonic, Islamic and European models. At the same time, heterogeneous elements in a person's life are treated with what may be called a "compartmentalized" (rather than situational) ethics. Heterogeneity and asynchrony are both self-consciously articulated definitions of the Egyptian experience, as important to an Egyptian as homogeneity is to a Japanese. Egypt is a "field" rather than a "particle" society. However, the field is constantly shifting and needs constant renegotiation by the individual. Westerners (and Japanese) might expect that this would lead to personal confusion or institutional instability, but this does not appear to be the case -- a concept which a theory of potential needs to accommodate in considering the options for personal development.

3. Japan

Meetings with the Japanese group were held in Tokyo in May of 1982. The group reviewed their presentations and furthered discussions on environments for the realization of potential in Japan. While in Japan, Dr. White, Professor LeVine, and Ms. Leonie Gordon visited schools and educational

facilities.

In opening discussions, current priorities in education were discussed with Dr. Hiroshi Kida, Director of the National Institute for Educational Research (Ministry of Education). One is the importance of starting young: Dr. Kida felt that Dr. Ibuka (Kindergarten is Too Late) has considerably exaggerated this idea, which gained popularity among parents who wished to gain advantage for their children in preparation for later exams.

Dr. Kida summarized his own view of current education, saying:

> . . .in the last thirty years there have been many borrowings and changes in the educational system but few real changes of social life. It is important to educate a new generation of children to be individual persons...The group model for work was excellent for catching up, but from now on, Japan's leadership in international interdependency is more important and for this we need individuals who can work with other than homogeneous units. We need to create individuals who can bridge the gap.

The papers presented at the workshop included: "An Historical and Psychological Analysis of Japanese Women's Lives," by Dr. Sumiko Iwao; "Biographies of Japanese Businessmen," by Dr. Eishun Hamaguchi; "The Application of Attribution Theory to Biographies," by Dr. Akira Hoshino; "Competition and Rivalry in the Japanese Company," by Dr. Yuichi Yamada; "Battered Parent Syndrome," by Michiko

Fukazawa; "Attitudes of Parents and Teachers Towards Childhood Socialization," by Dr. Shigefumi Nagano; "Biographies of Japanese Businesswomen," by Dr. Sumiko Iwao; "Parents' Beliefs and Attitudes about Children's Abilities," by Dr. Shigefumi Nagano.

Dr. Iwao's first presentation identified two general contexts for the realization of potential among Japanese women: 1) the potential for developing themselves, which, when realized, can lead to social change, and 2) their role as an agent for developing the potential of others, i. e., their husbands and particularly their children. She emphasized the persistence in modern Japan of traditional skills and perspectives. Specifically, the values of planning, ingenuity, and resource conservation are all important in the lives of successful women today. Similarly, the importance of relational skills, e. g., sensitivity to and anticipation of the needs of others, was stressed. According to Dr. Iwao, men seek opportunities to develop and broaden potential talents, while women wish to utilize existing abilities.

Dr. Hamaguchi portrayed careers in Japan as products of social relationships, in particular relationships between young people and more senior mentors. This kind of career pattern is called the "Jen" or the "contextual" type of career in contrast to the Westerner's self-reliant and

self-directed "individualistic" type. He also discussed the importance of group orientation:

> . . .a person who acts for the sake of his company in a manner that seems to outside members to involve great self-sacrifice will perceive his action as ultimately for his own benefit rather than a sacrifice of his own interests to others.

Dr. Yamada discussed the tracking of personal careers in the Japanese company, and the major factors affecting competition.

> In Japan there is an emphasis on mutual reliance rather than self-reliance. There is in Japanese mutuality an image of a separate self, but this is based on a different concept of the ego from that of Europe and America. Many workplaces have no job demarcation, as such. Japanese workers collaborate across hierachical lines, with peers, superiors and subordinates. [Ed. note: Since hierarchical status at the workplace is based on seniority, status differences are usually seen in terms of people being at different stages in their careers and most can feel that their turn too will come. The terms often used for these differences, sempai and kohai, literally mean "the one ahead (on the path)" and "the one following."]
>
> At the workplace Japanese do not rely on each other as individuals, but on the group itself for incentive, support and active teamwork in production.
>
> The second factor influencing competition in Japan is the emphasis on high moral standards and the importance of values at the workplace. The stress on standards of behavior has a strong moral component. Japanese companies phrase their policies in moral terms such as "Love Labor, Love Effort, Love Production." It is clear that although the Europeans call it workaholism and an obsession with efficiency, the Japanese give moral meaning to their striving for creativity and productivity.

Ms. Fukazawa presented several family histories

involving delinquency and abusive behavior by children. She discussed reasons for this behavior and possible avenues of treatment. She also presented data on school-related pathologies.

Dr. Nagano presented data on family activities and attitudes since the war, and raised questions as to paternal and maternal discipline. He also presented results of a series of children's time budgets. Parental attitudes regarding academic performance emphasize the importance of credentials. The relationship of parents to the school, however, can be characterized as a "cold war." With the increased pressure surrounding the school and workplace, extra-occupational activities have a higher priority, and traditional Japanese work attitudes may be changing.

In his report on parents' beliefs about children's intelligence, Dr. Nagano reported that parents feel that school is more important than the home in developing children's cognitive abilities. Fathers, however, stress the importance of the home more than do mothers. On the whole, in rural areas, parents rely upon the schools to develop their children, whereas in urban areas, especially among elites, parents emphasize the home environment.

4. China

In May of 1982, Dr. White and her assistant, Leonie Gordon, held a series of interviews, group discussions and private conversations with social and behavioral scientists, teachers, and education officials in Guangzhou, Shanghai and Beijing. They also paid visits to schools, vocational colleges, day-care centers, and training programs in the arts. Summaries and excerpts from these discussions follow, focussing on education, the family, and society. (See Appendix B for reference to full reports of these and other major meetings.)

Education in China is seen as composed of three elements in balance: cognitive development, moral education and physical education. Moral education imbues all educational settings, though it is less explicitly central than it was during the Cultural Revolution. A key moral focus in education today is the positive tension between cooperation and competition in learning. Children are seen as needing communal experiences to counteract individualism which one informant called "a natural inclination," especially in families adhering to the "one-child family" policy. In these one-child families, parents are seen as the potential problem, since they will "spoil" a single child through indulgence and will not teach him or her the principle of cooperation. The school must provide an environment where both cooperation and competition are appropriately encouraged. Cooperation provides a secure communal setting.

Competition gives children the drive to test themselves against others. Moral education is broadly construed to include political, social, sexual, ethical and intellectual morality.

After the Cultural Revolution, it became important to teach basic skills and develop standards of knowledge to be achieved in the schools. Children are now rewarded for high performance on tests by higher education or by better opportunities in "key schools" where children are given accelerated work. However, the "red versus expert" issue remains and people prefer to avoid specializations and expertise which may impugn their political purity. Professor Yuan at Guangzhou Teacher's College noted that there is, however, some positive recognition of individual ability: "Individual ability can be used by society and influences society. Society is developed through the efforts of individuals; the extent of the development of the society depends on the abilities of the persons themselves."

Other problems in education and society were noted, including the problem of youths "waiting for employment," largely in urban areas, who are susceptible to alienation and delinquency. Problems of poor morale among people who fail entrance examinations, who don't have satisfying work, or who are posted far from their families, are also considered major issues. The major women's issues are birth control, and, for

working mothers, the care of the household and family. Materialism is seen as a problem, especially in urban areas. As one informant said,

> Many urban people feel they live for themselves. They especially must transcend their personal interest to find meaningful lives. There are, of course, good reasons for youth to seek better material lives but there is no end to it. In the end, a simple livelihood means a more abundant life. The Sung poet Su Dongbo wrote a biography of a young man who was the son of a rich merchant fallen upon hard times who lived in a bare room and didn't care since he had devoted his life to higher principles. This story would be incomprehensible to young people who seek a higher material level today. Simplicity of life is a traditional Chinese value which may be disappearing today.

The same informant summarized his advice for the improvement of Chinese Education as follows:

> ...that education not be limited to the training of techniques and that monolithic (sic) American education is not suited to China, particularly not to the countryside. In a country of one billion people, every problem is magnified, but China is not worse than other developing countries, and may be better off. I look at the next decade with guarded optimism.

5. Latin America

In November of 1981, Dr. Marta Arango and Dr. Glen Nimnicht made a second visit to the Project to plan a workshop on human potential to be held in Medellin, Colombia. During that visit, Dr. Nimnicht became seriously ill. By the Spring of 1982 he had developed a backlog of commitments, due

to his illness, and was unable to serve as planner and coordinator of the Columbian workshop.

We contacted Dr. Raul Magana in Mexico, who had been a Project member and post-doctoral fellow at Harvard during the first year of the Project. He was able to coordinate planning for a workshop on human development and cultural diversity in Latin America. This workshop would be co-sponsored by CIIDET, a government sponsored educational research group, in Queretaro, Mexico, and would bring together a multidisiplinary team of Latin American scholars, including Drs. Arango and Nimnicht. That workshop would be held in the Spring of Year Four.

6. Africa

In October of 1981, an informal planning group for the African case was established, including members of the cross-cultural research group and two African scholars in residence at Harvard, Dr. Lamin Sanneh and Dr. Aziz Esmail. Dr. Sanneh, of the University of Aberdeen, was an Assistant Professor at the Harvard Divinity School where he taught courses on religion in Africa. He was completing a book on the impact of Christianty on African societies. Dr. Aziz Esmail of the University of Nairobi, a Visiting Scholar at the Divinity School, brought to the African case an interest in psychoanalysis in cross-cultural perspective. This

interest arose through his studies of a Sufi Muslim community. Also involved in the first planning meeting of the African case was Dr. Kadja Mianno Daniel, the Director of the Institute of Ethnosociology in Abidjan, the Ivory Coast.

A workshop entitled "African Models of Human Development: Implications for Education and Social Change" was planned for the following year, to be held in West Africa.

b. The Teaching and Learning Seminars

In accordance with the decision to use teaching and learning as a central theme in integrating the findings of the case studies a number of papers were prepared and meetings held to explore this topic. Over the course of the year, Ms. Pollak produced three Project papers based on her own research, and on discussions at the Project's bi-weekly Teaching and Learning Seminars: "Traditional Jewish Learning: Philosophy and Practice," "Traditional Islamic Education," and "Traditional Indian Education." Papers on Medieval European, Chinese, Japanese, and Buddhist Education were prepared in the Summer and Fall of 1982.

The Teaching and Learning Seminar was instituted for the purpose of exploring the following topics:

1) The goals and methods of learning in several environments (family, school and workplace) as laid out in scriptural and normative texts or precepts, as exhibited in the organization and structure of formal education, and as experienced by the learner.

2) The relationships of student/apprentice, teacher/master and the stages of mastery implied in the course of learning.

3) Anomalies: excellence and failure in different cultural settings for learning.

4) Traditional learning and schooling in the modern world, including issues of adaptation, complementarity or replacement, and transferability of learning systems across cultural boundaries.

Project members in regular attendance at the Teaching and Learning Seminars were: Professor LeVine, Dr. White, Ms. Pollak and Ms. Gordon. Other Project principals and staff attended on an irregular basis. One frequent guest participant was Mr. Dan Ran Mao, a Visiting Professor of Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, on leave from East China Normal University. Mr. Mao had surveyed formal Chinese education from kindergarten through university and alternative institutions of higher education both in China and the United States. His survey incorporated a historical overview beginning with the examination system of traditional China, through the post-1949 literacy campaigns of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, and ending with the present educational focus on the "Four Modernizations."

Mr. Mao outlined curriculum content and teaching methods at all levels of schooling and paid special attention to the ways in which political education is inculcated in China at all levels and in all contexts--family, school, community, work. He offered in-depth treatment of the following topics:

a) The role of "key schools" and "key classes" in fostering the special talents of gifted children (these schools and classes are intended both to serve the needs of the gifted and to act as models of achievement for regular classrooms);

b) The difference between Chinese and American education: for example, Chinese education is standardized throughout the country, emanating from the central government's Ministry of Education; Education is regarded as a collective, rather than an individualistic enterprise and children are encouraged to help each other learn; equal emphasis is laid on the moral, intellectual and physical growth of the student in accordance with Chairman Mao's famous 1957 dictum that "the nation's educational policy must enable everyone who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and to become a worker imbued with both socialist consciousness and culture."; The learning environments of home, school and community are integrated by means of close cooperation between parents, teachers and neighborhood groups;

c) adult education in its various manifestations -- factory schools, local night school programs, television and correspondence universities;

d) the nature of the Rencai movement, which focuses on nurturing individual talent so that it may result in productive and creative contributions to the larger society.

These discussions served to prepare Dr. White and Ms.

Gordon for their meetings in China in May, and provided background for Ms. Gordon's paper on Chinese Education.

Another regular participant in the Teaching and Learning Seminars, Dr. Aziz Esmail, discussed the relevance of Islam to concepts of the development of the person and the realization of potential in Islamic societies. These discussions included a survey of general precepts of Islam, specific treatments of Sunism, Shi'ism and Sufism, and a detailed examination of the text of the Qur'an as it informs man's role in society. Some of the themes which emerged were:

a) the notion of an ideal, highly emphasized in the Qur'an and deeply cherished among the believers, which overrides, but does not subsume, the vast range of local deviations and diversity;

b) the centrality of the shariy'a, or law, which defines the public behavior and actions of community members and imposes limits which restrain the behavior of individuals in the higher interests of the community;

c) "shariy'a-mindedness" in Islamic societies, which results in members thinking and acting in interpersonal terms, with strong emphasis on kinship, family and genealogy;

d) a focus on reason and rationality, as the manifestation of reason indicates the presence of God, hence, for example, the proscription on alcohol which reduces the powers of reason.

e) an emphasis on education as the means of fostering reason where it is seen to be absent and as a means to leading people towards the realization of universal truths which inhere in a combination of religion and philosophy.

These topics would be further discussed at a one-day workshop at the Project in September of 1982.

Our Scholar-in-Residence during Year Two, Dr. B.K. Ramanujam, paid regular visits to the Project to participate in the Teaching and Learning Seminar. In our discussions with him we focussed more on "realization" than on "potential." A distinction was drawn between Western industrialized "particle" societies and non-Western traditional "field" societies. (Japan represents a third category: an industrial "field" society.) In traditional "field" societies, due to social coordination and ascription, people are likely to be given appropriate places for the use of their own competence, or are able to develop the appropriate competences for the places they hold. Thus, traditional field societies might be said to offer limited potential but likely realization. Particle systems have no such concept of place. They give seemingly unlimited potential but lower chances for its full realization, due to limited resources and opportunities. Contributing to these differences may be the fact that Western "particle" religions are based on the idea of original sin and a judgmental God, and thus allow little hope of the individual's ever achieving total religious realization of "potential." Non-Western "field" religions, such as Islam, encourage the person to a state of religious perfectedness in this life or another, and

establish a path of finite tasks which a person actually can accomplish.

When the "particle" mode is introduced into the traditional "field" society, it is often difficult to provide a satisfying level of realization for certain groups, such as the increasing numbers of the college-educated or the newly mobile urban industrial workers. The World Bank maintains that the increasingly large number of baccalaureates in such societies will be spread to all levels of occupations and that the effect, for example, of these people teaching in primary schools where much less skilled persons had taught before, will be to raise the general level of competence in the society at large. This fails to address the question of the individual's own expectations for the utilization of his or her competence.

2. Current Models of International Development

As the cross-cultural research on the case study countries and on traditional teaching and learning came to fruition, the cross-cultural group focussed increasingly on questions concerning the employment of such findings by policy makers. In the Fall of 1981, the cross-cultural group reviewed and discussed literature on the models of development that are currently employed by many policy makers. These models, i.e., the current "practical theory"

most often employed by policy makers, were found to reflect the Western cultures within which they were born. They are based primarily on economic theories, concerning themselves with inputs (e.g., education) and outputs (e.g., increased income and productivity). Little attention is paid to the processes by which social institutions and individual lives are transformed. While local cultures and knowledge are considered in the design of programs, that consideration tends to enter into the implementation stage and not into the formulation of the goals and processes of development itself. Metaphorically speaking, native furnishings adorn the imported Western institution. Finally, these economic models generalize basic human needs to be utilitarian and materialistic. Universal measures of poverty are applied across cultures; thus, they may fail to distinguish between the experience of an impoverished refugee in Hong Kong and that of a beggar in Delhi, although the experience of poverty may have more meaning in one context than the other.

While these models of development are fairly deeply entrenched, they are the subject of some controversy in international development circles. Dr. Paul Streeten, of Boston University, and formerly of the World Bank, visited the Project to discuss controversies surrounding the "basic human needs" approach, including: 1) How, and by whom are basic needs to be defined; 2) Is participation of the population in planning aid programs an end in itself or a

means to moe efficient implementation; 3) What political purposes are served by such programs? Are they revolutionary or ameliorative?; 4) Does one seek to develop the population as a means to greater productivity or as an end in itself?; and 5) Whom does the aid ultimately benefit? Is the world "a community," mutually benefitted by such aid?

In Forum discussions of the limits of economic models, Dr. Gardner questioned whether Professor LeVine's emerging critique of current models of development would allow for any generalization about goals and methods. Professor LeVine responded that generalization must not be made on the basis of limited data. The danger of limiting the kinds of data (i.e., the disciplinary base of the "practical theory") is that ingrained assumptions (e.g., that more income and education is better than less) go unchallenged. Ethnopsychological data reveal the importance of subjective meanings: the traditional peasant may be happier than the tired, old, Japanese executive. There is no clear relation between material well-being and subjective well-being. This is not to urge a non-interventionist position or to romanticize traditional forms of meaning-making, but to urge that a plurality of forms of meaning-making be acknowledged, and that the desirability and possibility of transference of these forms across cultures be questioned.

To illustrate his point, Professor LeVine drew upon the

work of Ronald Dore, author of The Diploma Disease. Dore argues that the uncritical pursuit of educational expansion, with a "credentialist" ideology, has led to the creation of expectations beyond what some societies can fulfill. While one might not want to gauge educational expansion precisely to job opportunities (as, at least in our culture, education is often viewed as an end in itself) the kinds of education and concomitant expectations to be introduced must be chosen with some attention to the society's need for certain skills, and its ability to fulfill created expectations. We must avoid, in Dr. Ramanujam's terms, increasing potential for the masses, while opportunities for realization are available to few.

The opening chapter of Volume III would adopt the theme that the wide-ranging consequences of intervention must be anticipated, and that this is only possible through a detailed understanding of a culture's established goals and means for the realization of potential.

E. Evaluation and Planning

1. Outreach

a. American Advisors

In December of 1981, Professors Gibbs and Vogel, American advisors who were unable to attend the June meeting of the Board, visited the Project. Professor Gibbs emphasized the need to think beyond intellectual competences to supra-intellectual ones, as in Hindu India. He noted that Dr. Gardner's book would need support from many examples, including environments of formal and informal schooling, material on teacher-student transmission of knowledge, on stages of learning and types of competence valued in different cultures, as well as a treatment of historical development and change, including the influence of colonial or borrowed systems.

Professor Vogel contributed a critique of, and suggestions for our Chinese case study. He also commented on our Japanese case, saying that Japan is the most interesting experiment in human potential and needs powerful explication. It stretches our depictions of potential and its realization. A Japanese study of the spiritual/human side of productivity will be significant, and will provide a positive model for central guidance of development in society. He noted Japan's move from imitation to creativity. Dr. Gardner asked how people not accustomed to creativity can innovate. Professor Vogel noted a cultural reluctance to accept credit for creativity in Japan, which explains Japan's image as non-creative.

Professor Vogel cited other examples of "stretchers" of potential now occurring in Singapore, and elsewhere in East Asia. Singapore is a society based in Chinese culture where the social fabric and custom are intact throughout rapid development. It is less consensual, more "top-down" than Japan. Professor Vogel suggested that to succeed by this route, a society needs a large common core, an indigenous cultural consensus, and, in Professor Scheffler's terms, a "practical theory" about people. Dr. Gardner noted that in Japan it is reflexive to progress through culture; that we, on the other hand, relegate culture to a less significant position.

Professor Gibbs said that the use of any model which highlights the problems of using a Western model would be welcome in Africa. He offered many suggestions for African scholars as collaborators. He also discussed age-stages in cultural patterns of education, and made some comparisons between American and African definitions of the prime years for learning. He pointed to difficulties with our "case" approach, including: that the studies are not controlled; that we have no hypothesis; and that we don't collect data. We have to be clear on what we <u>are</u> doing, i. e., that case material is suggestive and illustrative rather than conclusive.

b. International Policy Makers

In June of 1982, Professor LeVine and Dr. White held meetings in New York with policy makers from The United Nations Development Program (UNDP), The Ford Foundation and UNICEF.

At the UNDP, they met with Orlando Olcese (of Peru) and Abebe Ambatchew (of Ethiopia). The UNDP, the largest agency within the UN, in terms of funding and scale of operations, evaluates education reform projects in developing countries. They are interested in the relevance of borrowed systems to the local environment. In their technical assistance programs, as well as their education programs, they pay serious attention to the local situation and the cultural setting. Dr. Olcese made particular reference to a network of adult vocational education programs in Latin America (SENA in Colombia, SENAI in Brazil, SENATI in Peru) which are focussed on the migrants to urban areas who have dropped out of formal school early in the primary years and who are unequipped to practice trade.

Dr. Ambatchew commented that our Project must not ignore the political dimension of the contexts for human development we treat. Access to learning and certification is dependent on <u>political</u> qualifications and environment in such places as China and Tanzania. On the other hand, what we may see as political (e.g., the Chinese premise of "serving the people")

may be better described in other terms. Such a message may be governed by economic scarcity rather than ideology, for example. Further, we must pay more attention to the relationship between education and social change. We all see education as a means for social change, but which comes first, and how? In the U.S., social change preceded changes in education. Professor LeVine responded that people expect education to change society and thus place a great burden on educational institutions to shape society.

In response to a presentation of the concerns to be expressed in Volume III, Dr. Olcese noted that not only in education, but in other fields, there is a growing concern about the one-model approach. In health, rural development and technical assistance, one way to avoid the single model is to encourage cooperation among developing countries. By this means alternative solutions may emerge from the countries themselves.

Dr. Olcese and Dr. Ambatchew agreed that attention must be paid to the sacrifices and difficulties incurred through the introduction of modern education in developing countries. Dr. Ambatchew once followed seven-year-old African children from their homes to their schools and noted that the walk was often 10 kilometers one way. These children often had to perform morning chores at home and had no breakfasts. Their ability to perform well in school was greatly hindered by

these conditions. He said in such cases, family and environmental influences were stronger than educational input in the realization of the child's potential. A different geographical distribution of schools was in order.

At UNICEF, Professor LeVine and Dr. White met with Dr. David Burleson, who would become a regular advisor to our Project, and his associates, Drs. Karen Smith, Mary Hollensteiner, Mansour Ahmed, Nico van Oudenhoven, and others.

The discussion focussed on a description of our Project's concerns. These people, chiefly child development advisors, were mainly concerned with interventions in critical situations affecting children (e.g., famine, drought, and forced migration,) and were actively involved with longer term projects. As one person said, UNICEF is an "operationalizing institution," designed to respond to urgent needs. Dr. Smith said their target groups are the most disadvantaged in a population, and the critical need, in terms of research and theory development, is to effectively reach the "bottom group" in a society. Dr. Hollensteiner noted that a radical rethinking of their programs is in order.

Dr. Burleson joined Professor LeVine's and Dr. White's meeting at The Ford Foundation with Dr. Robert Myers. In

this meeting, issues related to cultural dimensions of development were emphasized. Dr. Myers asked what is to be made of cultural diversity once it is recognized, and how development agencies ought to deal with it. Professor LeVine and Dr. White responded with a discussion of "alternative" and "cultural" models of development, and asked whether policy makers use models of this sort. Drs. Burleson and Myers suggested that different agencies treat culture differently but that culture is a motive force for organizations. Dr. Burleson said that in UNESCO the relevant term is "endogenous development." Programs of endogenous development minimize the importance of technology transfer, but when pushed to an extreme, lead to a situation in which every tribe reinvents the wheel, or to atavism.

Professor LeVine discussed the different ways in which culture can be used. In Mexico, pre-Colombian culture is used by public figures and academics to promote leftist or progressive nationalism, while in India, symbols of traditional Hinduism are negative reminders of the "backward past."

Dr. Myers mentioned several areas in which a consideration of culture is important to international development. Political/cultural considerations become important in questions relating to distribution of resources and "delivery" of interventions to satisfy basic needs. From

a strict "human capital" approach some economists have strayed to a more historical-anthropological perspective, through involvement with community surveys, in efforts to organize and assess the distribution of resources.

2. Project - Foundation Dialogue

In January 1982, Dr. Welling visited the Project to discuss the style and approach of each of the four volumes, and the timetable for their production. He brought to the meetings specific questions about the content of Dr. Gardner's volume concerning the theoretical status of the seven proposed intelligences. He followed up discussions he had had in September with Professor LeVine about our use of international advisors and our planning of the African case study.

A major topic for discussion at these meetings concerned procedural matters of publication. It was decided that we should attempt to have all four volumes appear under the same colophon. Proceeds from the sale of the books would be divided by some formula (to be negotiated) between the authors and a fund at the Harvard Graduate School of Education for student research on issues relating to human potential.

In May of 1982, Dr. Welling met briefly with Dr.

Gardner, Professor Lesser, and Professor Scheffler. (Dr. White and Professor LeVine were conducting the Japanese workshop in Tokyo at the time). Plans were made for the Project Principals to travel to the Hague in July.

The July meeting in the Hague consisted of substantial intellectual discussion of the Project's major themes with Foundation staff and consultants including Professor W.D. Wall, Dr. Leo Fernig, Dr. Gilbert de Landesheer, Dr. A. van Dantzig, and Dr. Franz Monks. Scientific theories of social change were discussed, and we were cautioned against viewing the Third World as the sole locus of societal change: the "advanced" nations are also changing and they represent diverse patterns of change. Professor Wall and Dr. Fernig discussed the models and approaches of development agencies, a discussion which proved particularly helpful in the writing of Volume III.

Dr. Welling acknowledged the progress made on Volume I by its single author, Professor Scheffler, and, accordingly, decided that the Foundation's contribution to the synthetic work of the Project would not be incorporated into that volume. Rather, it would be published in a separate volume. Dr. Fernig agreed to play a central role in that volume, "Volume Zero," although firm plans and commitments were not made until a later date.

The Project Principals returned from the Hague with a sense that their work would indeed be of interest to its intended audience, and looking forward to continued use of the Foundation and its network for critical reading of the Project manuscripts.

Year Four: Research, Writing, and Review

A. Overview

The fourth year of the Project represented a turning point from collecting, organizing, and developing the ideas which would form the basis of the volumes, to discussing, reviewing, and disseminating those ideas. For Dr. Gardner's volume, this turning point occurred early in the year. In the Fall of 1982 final discussions of his draft took place in Forum meetings. By February of 1983, final revisions were completed and the manuscript was sent to the publisher. Professor Scheffler's volume was completely drafted during the fourth year and sent to its publisher by the end of the fifth year. The draft of Professor LeVine's and Dr. White's volume was completed by the middle of the fifth year, since data collection for that volume, including the holding of the African and Latin American workshops, had continued through the fourth year.

B. Volume I: Israel Scheffler's Of Human Potential

By the beginning of the fourth year of the Project,

Professor Scheffler had outlined his volume in detail and had begun to draft chapters. In Chapter 1 he introduces the Project, its background and purposes, then introduces the topics to be treated in later chapters. Chapter 2 treats issues of human nature and values. Here he discusses the myths inherent in the common use of "human potential" and discusses the Kantian view of human nature and ethics which underlies his reconstruction of the concept. Chapter III presents the reconstruction according to the three interpretations (PI, CI, DI). Chapter IV applies the theory to some of the empirical findings of the Project (e. g., that there are critical periods for neurological development, that belief systems define potentials, etc.). The last chapter, Chapter V, discusses the relevance of the conceptual analysis for policy making.

In Forum discussions of Professor Scheffler's second chapter, the debate about the cross-cultural validity of the Kantian view of human nature resurfaced. Professor LeVine argued that our Western ideal of society as a collection of free and rational individuals is not universal, citing as a counter example collective family responsibility for crimes of an individual. Professor Scheffler judged this practice to be unjust; that it is common practice does not make it just, any more than graft among politicians becomes just through

increased incidence.

Professor Scheffler offered his definition of autonomy, as "the capacity to bind oneself freely by rule or principle, to act, not just as an object, in accordance with law, but as a person, in accordance with one's conception of law." This notion is quite different, he noted, from a Western middle-class notion of freedom. It is not opposed to cooperation. Professor Scheffler acknowledged the relativity of values adopted by cultures and urged not that value differences be discouraged or minimized, but that they be made explicit in contexts of "the development of others" so that they can be evaluated by any number of criteria, including their accordance with principles which respect the dignity of the individual affected. While Professor LeVine abstained from full support of the Kantian view he acknowledged that some of Professor Scheffler's material on universal qualities, in particular that on symbolism and time-binding, counteracted some early false beliefs about "primitives" as, for example, lacking memories.

Professor Lesser remarked that Chapter 2 as it was originally drafted was rather difficult reading for the general audience. He suggested that its style be made more accessible and that concern for the issues of

potential and human nature be more fully motivated in Chapter 1. Professor LeVine agreed that reading the material would require effort. He felt the effort would be made with proper motivation. Toward that end, he suggested citing examples of the use, without definition, of "human potential" in policy documents.

All Project members agreed that the first three chapters would be improved by more clearly and strikingly opposing the common view of potential to the reconstructed view. They offered suggestions of examples and illustrations which would be helpful to the reader in Chapters 3 and 4. Dr. White noted that the examples Professor Scheffler had used portrayed cultures as providing impediments to realization. She suggested including examples in which culture enhances realization.

C. Volume II: Howard Gardner's Frames of Mind

During the fourth year Dr. Gardner completed his draft, solicited and responded to readers' critiques, and sent his manuscript to be published by Basic Books.

Assisting Dr. Gardner with the final preparation of his manuscript was Linda Levine, a Masters student of psychology and philosophy. She had studied with

Professor Scheffler before joining the Project; after leaving the Project, she pursued a Ph.D. with a specialty in issues of affect and cognition. When she joined the Project in the Fall of 1982 the bulk of Dr. Gardner's manuscript was in draft form. Part I gave the background of the theory, discussing the history of ideas of intelligence and the definitions to be employed in the multiple intelligences theory. Part II presented the core of the theory. Part III discussed criticism as well as implications and applications of the theory. Ms. Levine assisted Dr. Gardner in responding to readers' critiques of the draft and revising accordingly, and she contributed to the development of the chapter on personal intelligences.

By the beginning of the fourth year, all Project members had read, and responded favorably to, the introductory sections of the manuscript and the individual chapters on the first five intelligences: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, and bodily-kinesthetic. During the Fall of 1982, Forum meetings were held to discuss the last chapters, Chapters 10-14.

Chapter 10 dealt with the personal intelligences: interpersonal (knowledge of others) and intrapersonal (knowledge of self). Professors Scheffler and LeVine

both urged that value issues be addressed here, particularly in the citing of examples of highly developed competence in these domains. Professor Scheffler noted that the sociopath may "read" people intelligently, but put that intelligence to malicious use. Professor LeVine noted that while political leadership may epitomize the highly developed personal intelligences in our culture, another culture may prize more private or spiritual personal development, or may require a very different profile of intelligence of their leaders. He also objected to the use of the term "intelligence" to denote personal knowledge and competence: if one stretches the term so thinly, it begins to lose its meaning.

Professor Lesser noted, however, that scholarly treatment of "personal intelligence" was not without precedent, and cited examples, including: Wechsler, on social intelligence, Witkin, on field dependence and interdependence, Rotter on internal and external locus of control, and the cognitive style literature. And even Piaget, whose cognitive theory Dr. Gardner aimed to broaden, placed emphasis on the ability to take the perspective of another person.

Professor Scheffler expressed his view that cognition and affect are inseparable, employing the

example of Einstein, whose affect was closely tied to his development of atomic theory and the implications of that theory.

Dr. Gardner responded that he would strengthen his case by clarifying what capacities he would include as personal intelligences, e. g., the ability to read one's own moods and those of others, and to correlate this knowledge with the situations which evoked them. He would make clear that he was not presenting the personal intelligences as affective, as opposed to cognitive, nor did he view the other intelligences, e. g. musical intelligence, as exclusive of affective components. Dr. Gardner agreed with Professor LeVine that the personal intelligences do seem to be of a different nature than the others, perhaps on a different level, but he reiterated his desire to account for as much as possible without resorting to a higher-level central processor.

Chapter 11 presented a self-imposed critique of MI, which discussed the limits of the computational model of intelligence and the failure of the theory to directly account for some aspects of broad, high-level capacities like originality and wisdom. While some Project members felt the chapter was unnecessarily apologetic, Professor Scheffler felt that an explicit loosening of the computational device metaphor was in order. A

computational device involves input of information, the performance of determined processes on that information, and an output. Not only is originality and wisdom unexplainable in these terms, Professor Scheffler argued, but some of the intelligences, especially the personal intelligences, are not adequately treated in such a model. Dr. Gardner remarked that psychologists tend to use the term "computational device" broadly; he was surprised at the strictness of Professor Scheffler's definition. This was one of many interdisciplinary discussions which helped to insure proper interpretation of the Project's material by a diverse readership.

Chapter 12 discussed ways in which intelligences become socialized through symbol systems. This chapter drew heavily upon Dr. Gardner's work at Harvard Project Zero on the development of symbolic capacities in children. Erin Phelps, a graduate student in human development, assisted Dr. Gardner in preparing material on creativity.

Chapter 13 served as a retrospective account of the development and uses of intelligences in different cultural settings, with emphasis on the various modes of transmitting knowledge that have been employed in the course of human history, including imitation, apprenticeship, traditional schooling, and modern

"de-contextual schooling." Chapter 14 discussed ways in which the MI theory could be applied in the planning and evaluation of contemporary educational programs. These chapters drew upon the Project's cross-cultural work, on Ms. Strauss's work on formal and informal education, and on Project discussions of the four modes of transmitting knowledge which were previously proposed by Dr. Gardner. One result of these discussions was the elimination of "biological" as a mode of transmission; all modes rely on a biological base.

Professor LeVine felt that the number of examples employed in Chapters 13 and 14 was distracting, and suggested employing a few well-chosen and well-elaborated examples. He was also helpful in guiding the revision of Chapter 13 to take full advantage of the insights gained in our studies of traditional schooling. He suggested that Dr. Gardner discuss educational settings in different cultural contexts not simply in terms of what is valued, but also in terms of the ways in which societies and cultures recognize and formalize knowledge in different domains. For example: What are the standards of evaluation? How is the transmission of knowledge viewed and carried out? What roles does the society educate its populace to fill? What status is assigned to these roles? How specialized are these roles? Who is expected to fill

them, in terms of age, class and gender? Professors LeVine, Lesser, and Scheffler concurred that cultural values ought to be examined not simply on the level of educational ideology and practice (which, for example, shows our society to be most concerned with logical and linguistic intelligence) but also with respect to broad societal values (which would, for example, show our society to value high achievement in business, politics, entertainment, and sports). Similarly, while our educational ideology does not overtly stress moral development and socialization, as much as, for example, traditional religious schools or modern Japanese schools, it should be noted that these goals are implicitly adopted in modern Western schools.

Dr. Gardner found these suggestions and the suggestions of his outside readers helpful in making final revisions. By February 1983 the manuscript was sent to Basic Books. Bound books appeared in September of 1983.

D. Volume III

1. Research

a. The Case Studies

1. Africa

In January of 1983, participants from the Ivory Coast, Senegal, the Gambia, and Nigeria met with Project members in Banjul to present papers and to discuss concepts and environments related to human development in several West African cultural settings.

The meetings began with presentations by Dr. Boubacar Barry and Dr. Cheikh Ba on regional history and local nomadic traditions. Dr. Barry described the political history of the region, the economy, and the cultural unity which has persisted through colonial separation. A discussion followed of the role of ethnic cohesion in the political reunification of Senegambia. Dr. Ba then discussed the problems which occur when traditional nomadism confronts contemporary political, social, and economic development. Using the Peul of Senegal as an example, he presented pastoral value systems and societal patterns and discussed the impact of modernization upon them.

The second session treated social change and personal transformation. Lamin Sanneh presented a paper on healing and conversion in African new religions, in which he argued that conversion, though it may open new frontiers, also helps to consolidate and reinforce

existing modes and patterns of perception of the person and of the community. Conversion is thus not a repudiation of one's culture, or of one's past; it is a process of renewal and revitalization.

A discussion followed about the personal and societal stress leading to conversion. Dr. Sanneh noted that the circumstance of conversion need not determine the outcome of conversion. Negative precipitants do not necessarily produce negative outcomes. The question of why conversions were more often to Christianity than to Islam was raised. Dr. Sanneh cautioned against characterizing conversions by their sect or religion. Rather, he argued, one ought to examine the underlying rationale of the conversion: Is it to spark revitalization (Christianity) or to check dislocation and "impurity" (Islam)? The history of both Islam and Christianity in West Africa was recapitulated.

Professor LeVine presented two views of stress. On one view, cultural traditions are seen to provide symbolic solutions that are meaningful and effective in reducing stress. Thus, when people use symbolic elements from the religions of their past in new combinations to solve their current problems, they are drawing upon a source of strength, not exhibiting weakness.

On another view, following Durkheim, stress is a symptom of social disintegration. Professor LeVine disagreed with this view, particularly as it is applied to explanations of new religious movements. He pointed out that a very large proportion of people who come to the new religions are women (and some men) seeking cures for infertility. Certainly the problem of infertility is not one that can be seen as a sign of the disintegration of a society. In fact, the desire to continue reproduction is a sign that these people are operating with goals derived from their indigenous cultures.

Dr. Anumonye's paper on traditional healing raised questions of appropriate uses of indigenous therapies in development. The tensions between orthodox ("scientific") medicine and traditional healers were discussed. Examples from traditional bone-setting and treatment of mental illness were cited.

In the session on Family, Gender Roles and Child Development, Dr. Ekejiuba analyzed African women's roles during social change. How men see women's roles was contrasted to how women see themselves. She noted that the separation of spheres of influence and activity yields much de facto autonomy for women, but they are

perceived by men only as consumers of the wealth brought in by men.

Continuing the discussion of the gap between public and private definitions of gender roles, Professor LeVine urged that female deference not be interpreted simply as a denial of power and autonomy. All Nigerian women, he argued, pay a strong degree of deference to their husbands, yet they are among the most autonomous, striving and well-adjusted of all women. Even Hausa women, who are sequestered and "non-productive" until their child-bearing years are over, have devised strategies for pursuing their own interests through divorce, through securing the loyalty of their own children, or through entrusting the raising of their children to their own mothers. When the father's legal custody over his children has little meaning, because the children are bonded to the maternal side of the family, it indicates that the women have developed their own interests to a significant degree. Dr. White drew an analogy with Japanese women who may seem "dependent," but who are not "passive." The Japanese woman sees obedience to her husband not as a hierarchical stricture, but as supporting the family, within which she exercises a great deal of control.

When Dr. Ekejuiba was asked what she saw as

peculiarly West African in the structures and dynamics of male/female relationships, she pointed out that the emphasis on fertility, marriage, and children is greater in West Africa than in the West. Children are the primary motivation and goal for women, with or without marriage, and provide women with their identity. She also noted that within traditional systems, planning for family and children was done by men and women in parallel and complementary fashion. The modern system assigns planning to the male domain, to the detriment and alienation of women's interests. Whereas the traditional pattern for women was to live physically and emotionally independent lives, the modern system of imbalanced roles has created dependency and unease. Dr. Anumonye added that education, particularly higher education is stressed for boys over girls.

Dr. Bakare's paper treated child development within the mother-child relationship. The African child may not receive the cognitive stimulation of his or her Western counterparts, but social and moral development receives greater attention. In addition, reasoning ability is fostered by a variety of early training methods. But it is in the area of emotional development, Dr. Bakare argued, that the African child excels with the close, physical bonding of mother and child producing children who generally are amiable,

unaggressive and socially adaptable.

Professor LeVine discussed differences between African and American infants and children. He noted among the Gusii of Kenya the "soothing pattern": a rapid responsiveness to crying, frequent and extended breast-feeding and constant bodily contact. The goal of the mother, or the caretaker, is to keep the child in a calm, quiescent state. Professor LeVine sees that goal as having evolved as an adaption to high infant mortality rates, particularly in subSaharan Africa, and as assuming the form of preventive pediatrics among populations with high infant mortality rates. This is in contrast to modern Western childrearing patterns which tend to emphasize stimulation and arousal in the interaction between mother and child. Comparative studies of two-year-olds, show the American child more often behaving in the "tantrum" mode and the typical West African child being less demanding, more easily soothed and exhibiting emotional resources which make them less vulnerable to failures of expectation or disappointment. Professor LeVine concurred with Dr. Bakare that psychic durability begins at this point.

Professor LeVine also noted that African children develop a strong sense of common property and common resources very early in life. This differs from the

concept of sharing in the Western middle-class context, where parents concern themselves with how children can learn to share as a secondary exercise, unlearning the notion of private property, so to speak.

In the session "Childhood and Social Change: Africa and the Third World", Dr. Gardner outlined issues of concern to the Project which had emerged in the workshop but had not been treated in depth:

1. the experience of adolescence
2. male images and issues
3. old age: what are cultural expectations for old age and what are its virtues or problems?
4. the unit of potential: is it the person, the family (and what unit is called "the family") the clan or tribe, the nation?
5. the notion of a valued person
6. the "sense of self": is this a useful notion in the African context?
7. future prospects for education in West Africa?

In order to spur discussion on these topics and others, Professor LeVine outlined assumptions commonly adopted by Western theorists of the Third World:

1. Autonomy is a primary goal of individual development.
2. Work and occupational roles are primary identities for individuals and particularly for men.
3. Women's roles embody an inherent conflict between mothering and work.
4. Intellectual and cognitive development is of primary importance.

This led to a discussion of the special

environmental and cultural factors in West Africa which contribute to practices and conceptions of human development in the area. First, there is a high fertility rate and low urbanization, in the context of a high value placed on family: this produces the primacy of kin ties even in urban areas, and a focus on one's village of origin. Relationships are key to a good life, and imagery and references are constantly focussed on kin and clan. The parent-child relationship is salient over the entire lifespan, and extends to ancestor veneration in African religions. Children are seen as the solution to many problems, and the lack of them the principal cause of stress.

Old age, for men and for women, is seen as bringing honor and reverence. If a person has had children, he is assured of a good burial; he has the satisfaction of being consulted on village matters; and, he is closer to reincarnation. Older women are permitted greater symbolic and other privileges, are privy to community secrets, and exercise familial control.

In a summary session, each participant outlined his or her research perspective on African human development. Dr. Kadja stressed the primacy in Africa of the group over the individual. Even in the area of healing and religion, illness is regarded as a

collective manifestation and responsibility. While individual achievements are recognized and valued in the African setting, they are nevertheless viewed as the result of collective support; the collectivity is seen as generally capable of higher achievement than the individual. This primacy of the group, Dr. Kadja argued, should be incorporated into the policy formulation of the international agencies operating in Africa.

Dr. Ekejiuba urged an emphasis on plural, rather than single, models of African human development. She endorsed Dr. Kadja's notion of the importance of the group but expressed concern that individual achievement not be seen as occurring at the expense of the group. She cited the common example of the businessman who uses the benefits of his individual education to achieve success and then shares the rewards with his group. Status and prestige do not accrue from the degree of wealth which the man has attained but rather from the means he employs to promote the welfare of the group.

Dr. Sanneh stated an urgent need to present a case for developing African models from a social science perspective to counter and go beyond the prevailing econometric models promoted by many international agencies. He also called for a project-oriented

approach in which Western-trained scholars could coordinate existing materials and research and apply them to appropriate developing areas.

Mrs. Tambajan (UNDP) expressed the hope, along with Dr. Bakare, that sociological and cultural aspects could be incorporated into educational programs in UN projects, such as a forthcoming study of female circumcision, and the World Health Organization's family planning program in Nigeria.

Dr. Anumonye and Dr. Ekejiuba noted that there have been many recent examples of traditional cultural patterns exerting themselves in modern contexts: there has been a recent renaissance of culture. Many people have returned to their villages for marriage alliances, and for birth and death rituals. Social scientists should note this trend and incorporate it into development planning.

2. Latin America

The "Workshop on Human Potential and Cultural Diversity in Latin America" was held in Guadalajara in March of 1983. It was organized by Dr. Raul Magana of CIIDET. (Centro Interdisciplinario de Investigacion y Docencia en Educacion Tecnica) and sponsored by CIIDET. Participants were drawn from scientific, practical, and humanistic fields to consider issues common to the worlds of action and reflection as they arise in the contexts of contemporary Latin American life.

The first presentation, by Jose Pliego and Raul Magana, analyzed indigenous concepts of "community" and "neighborhood" and offered the environment of the city of Guadalajara as an example of problems and perspectives in urban development.

The paper by Drs. Arango and Nimnicht, "Organized Environments to Enhance the Development of Persons and Communities in Isolated Regions of Columbia: A Challenge to the Development of Human Potential", discussed a rural project, organized as PROMESO and sponsored by the Bernard van Leer Foundation, in rural Columbia. Carlos Eduardo Vasco also presented a paper focussed on Columbia, looking at the mobilization of an urban barrio.

A series of broad conceptual papers followed: Carlos Corona discussed "anthropocultura", in which "culture" is seen as a focus for civilization of the person. Tomas Miklos presented two papers: "Human Potential" and "Anticipating the Future". He noted that the problem of underutilization of human resources in Mexico cannot be successfully treated until basic education is improved. He cited statistics showing that drop-out rates in primary and junior high schools are high, and that 70% of those over 15 years of age are functionally illiterate. The problems, he argued, are in teaching and learning methods and these are in turn located in the bureaucratic nature of schooling and its relationship to central governmental bodies. Dr. Miklos noted some elements contributing to conceptions of potential in Mexico. Briefly, potential in Mexico is closely tied to ideas about personal intention and effort in the context of a strong social nexus. He also remarked that realization of human potential in Mexico involves the avoidance of impediment.

Juan LaFarga presented "The Central Focus on the Person in Mexico: Experience and Reformulation". He noted that marginal people, the victims of oppression, are the agents of social change, yet they lack control of their own personal potential.

Mariano Ortega, in "Cultural Contexts for Individual Performance and Organizational Behavior" analyzed performances by administrators, managers, and their employeees. The relationship between the person and the organization was examined in several dimensions, and different kinds of relationships were arranged in a typology: symbolic, rational, relational, practical and structural. All exist everywhere, but are differently emphasized. In Mexico, the structural-symbolic dimension is stressed.

Carlos Garcia, in " A Comparative Analysis of Mexican and North American Executive Profiles" noted that Mexican executives are similar to those in the U.S. in several respects, but their family of origin profile differs, and they are on the average younger then their North American counterparts. The implications of these profiles were discussed.

Josefina Quintanilla's paper on aging in Mexico, "Toward Permanent Maturity," raised questions about the potential of the elderly. The word for retirement is, ironically, "jubilacion" or happiness. There is some effort to make post-employment years productive. However, the experience of the older person is a threatening one. Retirement is unwelcome and largely

unbuffered. Dr. Quintanilla urged that Mexico plan to prepare for its aging society. In discussions, the African model of aging was described, in which retirement is not an issue: one works until one drops in the fields or until strength fails. It is only if work is the measure of the person, valued above other activities and contexts, that inability to work presents a serious problem. If, on the other hand, family and relationships are central, then aging is cast differently.

Juan Acha, in "The Potential of our Artistic Reality" considered Latin American problems in realizing artistic potential. He argued that Latin America needs a critical, transforming core of knowledge to inform its art. The institutional, historical, cultural and socio-political realities of Latin America must be emphasized, he argued, and the domination of a U.S. hegemony avoided. A discussion of Marxist perspectives on art followed.

Ezequiel Nieto presented "Scientific Investigation and Social Condition", in which he examined the institutionalization of science and the division of labor among scientists. Topics considered as valued for research are politically and socially determined. Some topics which cry out for treatment, such as the

birth rate, or environmental conditions, are not treated with the breadth and depth required. For example, the per capita income is said to be on the increase, but it is not, among the "humble classes". The social responsibility of the scientist, he argued, needs to be reinforced.

The workshop included several summary sessions in which the themes and topics of other workshops were compared to those of the Latin American workshop. Finally, the Mayor of Guadalajara, Vallarta Plata, gave a presentation on citizen participation in community development, discussing the ideals and the reality of urban life in Mexico.

b. Teaching and Learning

Research on teaching and learning, with emphasis on traditional schooling, continued through the fourth year. The primary form of that research shifted from regular meetings with consultants and staff to paper preparation by staff members. Susan Pollak wrote papers on Medieval European education, Buddhist education and Qu'ranic schooling. Leonie Gordon wrote a paper on traditional and modern education in China. Dr. White and Ms. Taniuchi wrote a paper on teaching and learning in Japan. These papers would be drawn upon in Volume

III for data and illustrations supporting the major thesis.

Paul Fulton, a graduate student in human development, wrote a paper in indigenous concepts of the self which proved helpful in the writing of chapter 2 on agrarian societies. Suzanne Kirschner, another graduate student, wrote three papers on ideological concepts of childhood which would provide background for chapter 3 on social transformations of childhood and the family. Elizabeth Fine, a research assistant with background in international development, wrote a paper on the rise of universal schooling and conducted literature reviews on international development and women which proved useful in the writing of several chapters.

Two major Teaching and Learning meetings were held during Year Four. The first represented a culmination of the meetings held during Year Three on Islamic education. The second focussed on historical shifts in ideologies concerning children in Japan.

The workshop on Islamic education was held in September of 1982. Participants included Aziz Esmail, Lamin Sanneh, Daniel Wagner, Ali Banouazzizi, Sarah LeVine, and Project members.

Professor LeVine opened the meeting with a discussion of the Project's goal of developing a "practical theory" for policy makers. He stressed the importance of scholars avoiding propagation of cultural stereotypes, particularly in the case of Islam, which is already highly stereotyped, particularly by the U.S. media. He also noted the importance of studying traditional schools in their larger societal contexts.

This point was reinforced by Professor Wagner, who found in his studies of three Islamic societies, that traditional means of learning to read and write are reflected and reinforced in the outside society in a dialectical manner, suggesting that the school system cannot be meaningfully analyzed as a discrete unit. Dr. Sanneh agreed, claiming that the educational system is an instrument which has a wider application in the society. The school closely reflects the hierarchical society in which it operates. In less hierarchical societies, one finds less hierarchical schools. For example, there will be less separation of students by age or ability and no formal graduation. In societies where political organization is refined, even the teacher is subjected to hierarchical placement according to competence; there, he can be ousted, whereas in the

simpler society, he is his own master. Professors LeVine and Wagner noted other factors which influence the structure of the school, including level of resources, resource management, and the nature of the political regime.

A discussion followed about the qualities of Qu'ranic teachers, in terms of credentials and moral character. Dr. Sanneh pointed out that it is for young children that the character and presence of the teacher is of paramount importance; later, the Qu'ran itself becomes the focal point of education for the child, as he becomes able to translate and understand it.

Drs. Sanneh and Ismail discussed differences between Arabic and African forms of Islam. The Arabic form is marked by strict adherence to laws of family, status, and property. In the African form, qualities of charisma and spirit force are predominant. They also noted differences in attitude toward Western education. Islamic Africans tend to view Western education as creating mechanical minds and failing to instill moral qualities. Iranian students, Dr. Esmail noted, view Western scientific knowledge with cynicism, yet they disdain the mullahs for their lack of it. Detailed discussion followed about the meaning and language of the Qu'ran and about the adaptation of Islam to the

African context.

Ali Banouazzizi then laid out five general principles of Islamic tradition. First, the Islamic community is central to Islamic thinking. Freedom is not articulated as an individual right, but as a general principle for peaceful conduct in the community. Second, the "living tradition of the dead" is pervasive. To a greater extent than in Western societies, the lives of great individuals are used for inspiration. Third, as in the orthodox Judaic tradition, great emphasis is placed on interpretation of nuances of language. Fourth, Islam pervades every aspect of life. There is a deep suspicion of innovation and a fear of contamination in Islam. Dr. Banouazzizi claimed that orthodox Muslims would be uncomfortable with Dr. Sanneh's views concerning the adaptation of Islam to local traditions in Africa. Discussion followed about the universality of Islam, i.e. its rejection of pluralism, which was seen as both its greatest strength and its greatest weakness.

In April of 1983, the Teaching and Learning group sponsored a half-day workshop entitled "Transitions in Ideology and Institutions Related to Children, Tokugawa to the Present". Guest speakers at that meeting were: Laurel Cornell, a social anthropologist concerned with

historical demography; Samuel Coleman, an anthropologist interested in population-related issues; and Eleanor Westney, a sociologist concerned with the social history of Japanese organizations.

Dr. Cornell presented demographic data on a village in southern Japan between 1670 and 1870 and discussed the value of children for family continuity, labor, and old-age security. The demographic transitions preceeding and during modernization were discussed. Dr. Westney discussed the internal and external pressures in Japan to borrow educational and political institutional forms from the West. Dr. Coleman discussed historical shifts in the status of women and their sources of motivation to have children. Discussion followed on a number of topics including contemporary Japanese ideology concerning children.

c. International Development

During Year Four, Professor LeVine and Dr. White continued to meet with representatives from international agencies concerned with human development.

In October of 1982, they, along with Project consultant Daniel Wagner, met with representatives of UNICEF in New York: Robert Myers, David Burleson, Nico

Van Oudenhoven, Mansoor Ahmed, and Dorothea Banks.

Dr. van Oudenhoven began the discussion of the relationship between the social sciences and UNICEF operations by saying that UNICEF "philosophy" is pragmatic; theory is anathema. He said that an "agricultural" approach, rather than social science is used in human development. Interventions are seen as totally bound by a particular ecology and can never be repeated, since a vast array of contextual variables would need to be considered. They are, therefore, very hesitant to make predictions.

Dr. Ahmed took exception to the strength of these remarks and claimed that some level of generality could be achieved from looking carefully at what people can control and what they cannot. UNICEF does believe that interventions lead to progress; they do not simply alleviate problems.

In a discussion of UNICEF's role, Dr. Ahmed described it as an advocate, where the countries themselves establish goals and principles of actions. No general policy is followed in all countries. Dr. Myers disagreed saying that UNICEF does have a "policy" and that it is based on what might be called a "middle-level theory," with a high enough level of

generality but with enough particular distinctions to be legitimate to those operating on the ground. He said that their use of typologies reveals implicit theories but that they need a larger historical analysis.

Contrasting UNICEF and the World Bank, Dr. Myers said that UNICEF had as its starting point a declaration of principles of human rights, while neoclassical economic theory characterizes the World Bank.

Dr. Ahmed discussed the evolution of UNICEF, over the past twenty years, from a "relief organization" focussed on disaster aid, to a social development agency, more based in theory. This pan-institutional change was paralleled by developments in education, health and welfare sectors, in which research is explicitly brought back to the social context. UNICEF's current concern with "participation", Dr. Myers said, is based in both pragmatic and moral concerns.

Dr. Burleson said that UNICEF is constrained both operationally and politically and tends to work in a state of suspended animation, as far as its "localism" is concerned. He said that the reason there are so many incalculable side effects in its programs is that it cannot "talk down" to the community level because its structure is not local. He said that "endogeneous

development" tended, in some circles, to advocate local culture at all costs and that this sometimes led to reinventing the wheel. Dr. Wagner claimed that the idea of endogenous development remains at an abstract level, and rarely becomes actualized.

In a discussion of the establishment of priorities concerning children, Dr. Ahmed said that it is important to ask in a particular country what kind of attention is devoted to children before proceeding with implementation programs. Our ideas about the love and attention required of children tend to be ethnocentric. Non-Westerners might point to cuts in such programs as medical immunization as an indication that our society does less for children than socialist countries. Dr. van Oudenhoven noted the difficulty in defining what a child is in some groups. In some UNICEF nations, migrant, handicapped or racially "outcaste" children are not seen as "children" to be cared for by the society. He also cited the case of young household servants in the Middle East, who are not considered to be children. He noted that "our children" in Indonesia means that family's children as opposed to all children in the society.

Dr. Banks mentioned a successful project in the Brazilian favelas which began with the concerns adults

had about garbage collection and resulted in benefiting children. Such experiences led to a shift in UNICEF from direct service to children to working with communities, families and mothers as an indirect route to helping children. Dr. Myers noted that while there are usually no child development experts on any given UN team, it is generally accepted, world-wide, that to deal with society is to deal with children.

In January of 1983, Professor LeVine and Dr. White met in Geneva with Leo Fernig and paid visits to several UN research institutes, including UNRISD (UN Research Institute for Social Development), UNICEF and The World Health Organization.

UNRISD focusses on "livelihood and participation in development goals." Current research topics include: the impact of migration on the role of women; studies of food systems from producer to exporter; and local-level monitoring of development in specific areas such as Kerala. UNRISD also maintains a Research Data Bank of development indicators for all UN countries. Dr. Solon Barraclough, the director, gave a critique of the use of economic models in development, saying that they tend to eliminate the possibility of looking at process as well as input and output.

The meetings at UNICEF included Dr. Yves Pelle, and Dr. Thierry Lemaresquier, and others. Like their colleages in New York, they located the orientation of UNICEF mid-way between social science theory and pragmatism. Dr. Pelle described the organization as "creating the conditions in which things can happen." It does not implement a passive transfer of resources, but allows for choices to be made. A sensitivity to culture and environment is required to make these choices.

Dr. Lemaresquier acknowledged the importance of local cultural heritage, but said that in some places, people are unable to use their own traditions, to "instrumentalize their roots." He also remarked that an examination and evaluation of the American model of industrialization as it is applied to developing countries has been a post-war "taboo" topic; one which would slow development. He urged, for example, that the effect of agribusiness on local agrarian traditions be examined.

Dr. Pelle said that a minimum national consensus is needed before any intervention can succeed over time: without a united agreement of some kind, continuity of effect cannot exist. He cited problems of

poorly-coordinated efforts in Mozambique. He argued that inherited (colonial) bureaucracies always represent a brake on development, which insulate a country against reform, and perpetuate and concentrate privilege.

While in Geneva, Professor LeVine and Dr. White met with other policymakers including: Michael Huberman, of the Faculty of Education at the University of Geneva, with whom they discussed the role of social sciences in development; with Dr. T. Adeoye Lambo, Deputy Director of the World Health Organization for discussions concerning the encouragement of local conceptions of healing; and with Ward Heneveld and Katherine Pfitzer, with whom they discussed the work of their agency, the Aga Khan Foundation.

In June of 1983, Professor LeVine and Dr. White met with representatives of the World Bank, most of whom are economists or working with economic models in educational programs. They were: David Davies, Richard Durstine, Hon-chan Chai, Michael Wilson, Mulugeta Wodajo, Damianos Odeh, Richard Johanson, Dr. Ruiz-Esparza, Ricardo Moran, and Jane Koslowsky.

Professor LeVine and Dr. White opened the meeting with a presentation of the major themes of their volume. First, Professor LeVine critiqued the predominantly

economic models employed in policy making, and urged that an anthropological approach be incorporated, which would reveal the cultural meanings of benefit and advantage. Second, he urged that education be viewed beyond the context of schooling and occupational preparation to include parental attitudes and investments in children, and to extend across the life span. Dr. White described the case studies and the questions they raised about the impact of the introduction of mass schooling.

The representatives of the World Bank raised questions which demonstrated their interest in the topics presented and indicated that they have become frustrated by the "technocracy" within which they operate. Dr. Davies agreed that a new analytic model was in order; in its application of standard economic paradigms to educational issues, the World Bank finds no place for "soft" sociological and psychological data, much less for cultural data. He suggested that we work closely with an economist with social science leanings to further our understanding of the seriousness of this problem.

Dr. Moran remarked that most of the requests for assistance that the World Bank receives are directed toward "Western" goals and adopt "Western" procedures

and solutions. It is difficult in these cases to decide whether to offer assistance employing the countries' own analysis, or to adopt models that the World Bank has employed successfully elsewhere in the world.

Dr. Esparza noted that programs adapted to local needs can be met with resistance. For example, if a different curriculum is offered in rural and urban areas, rural parents feel that their children are being "condemned to be peasants"; they demand the urban curriculum, which is seen as offering upward mobility.

Dr. Durstine questioned whether we might be accused of replacing one Western model with another. He questioned whether we were measuring success by Western indicators (e. g., the success of schooling in Japan), and whether our discussion of women's lives would be in contemporary Western terms. He also remarked that to ask what works and what doesn't is a Western question. Dr. Wilson acknowledged that our case studies were designed to document alternatives to these perspectives, but expressed concern that current literature offers little in the quest for a "deeper picture."

Professor LeVine and Dr. White offered examples from our work indicating that our interest is in documenting alternative meanings of advancement and

success rather than in providing blueprints from any particular cultural setting. Professor LeVine referred specifically to literature on fertility, infant mortality, and parental attitudes toward children, and discussed the trade-off decisions that parents make (shaped largely through their culture) regarding quality of family life and quantity of children.

2. Writing and Discussion

Over the course of the fourth year, the outline of Volume III was revised twice. Initially, the volume was to focus on the critique of international development models. Then, the primary focus was to be an historical examination of the origins of current issues in international development. In the final outline, these two topics would receive equal attention; the overarching theme which would serve to integrate them would utilize Dahrendorf's concept of "life chances" (described below) as secured through a culture's achievement of balance between "options" and "ligatures." This perspective on facilitating the realization of potential would be offered as an alternative to the perspectives on progress underlying current models; its usefulness would be demonstrated by its illumination of historical shifts in conceptions of childhood and potential. Deeper understanding of these

historical shifts, the authors hoped, would lead to more successful and culturally sensitive interventions. Comparative data, as well as historical data, would be presented and analyzed, employing the concept of life chances.

The first Forum meeting for the discussion of Volume III focussed on Chapter 5, which employed the Japanese case study to present one model for the balance of options and ligatures. Japan has adopted educational goals similar to Western educational goals, yet has achieved them through means consistent with Japanese culture. While promoting educational advancement through formal schooling involving competitive testing, it has avoided the promotion of individualism as it is defined in Western "particle" societies. A discussion ensued of the student-mentor relationship, which in Japan is meant to be "loyal" and harmonious. A contrast was drawn with mentor relationships in America in which spirited intellectual debate and innovative thinking are valued. This led to a discussion of the problems of promoting creativity within the strictures of social harmony.

A later Forum discussion focussed on Dahrendorf's concept of "life chances," as it was introduced and employed in Chapter 1 of Volume II. Dahrendorf argues,

in his book Life Chances, that while modernization has increased options, it has been at the cost of dissolving ligatures: the social bonds that give meaning to the options. As these bonds are destroyed, the individual must bear the burden of finding idiosyncratic meaning in options -- a burden as fettering as "the ties that bind." Dahrendorf claims that "life chances" are optimized by achieving a balance between options and ligatures. He argues that modernization theorists promote individual autonomy, where what may be required, in our terms, for the realization of potential, is the creation or renewal of ligatures.

The field-particle debate (see section IIIB) resurfaced: How "real" are the options? Doesn't the modern "particle" society experience illusory freedom while conforming to norms of competition and individuality? Dr. Gardner suggested that one test of the truly ligature-oriented society would be that in which severe consequences resulted from refusal to follow the prescribed course. Does the argumentative Japanese student or the submissive and unoriginal American student suffer more severe ostracism?

E. Volume IV: An Anthology

The purpose of the fourth volume was to provide a

means by which selected papers prepared by case-study participants could be published. To assist her in selecting and editing papers, Dr. White enlisted the aid of Ms. Pollak, who had served on the Project since 1980, researching ideas of potential and forms of schooling from both historical and cross-cultural perspectives.

This volume was not intended to represent all cultures and disciplines examined by the Project. Rather, it would provide illuminating examples of the variety of culturally-defined concerns and concepts relating to human potential and its realization.

F. Dissemination and Review

Over the course of the Project, faculty members at the Harvard Graduate School of Education had expressed interest in learning of the Project's approach and its findings. In response to this interest, and for the purpose of eliciting useful critiques, the Project Principals presented their findings at a Faculty Colloquium in February of 1983.

The Project Principals also made individual presentations of their findings at a number of conferences and colloquia. Dr. White presented her work on socio-cultural issues in Japan at Yale University in

April, 1983, and made presentations on women and education, and on Japanese education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She and Professor LeVine presented a paper on child development in Japan at a conference at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University in April of 1983. Dr. Gardner addressed a number of groups on the topic of multiple intelligences including the National Art Education Association to whom he presented a keynote address. Professor Scheffler wrote a paper "Human Nature and Potential," which he presented at an annual meeting of the American Educational Studies association, and which was published in Educational Studies, (Fall 1983), and in a Festschrift in honor of R. S. Peters (in press).

During this period, the Project also held meetings and corresponded with a number of scholars, including Sumiko Iwao, David Burleson, John Passmore, Kurt Fischer, Paul Streeten, and William Graham.

G. Project-Foundation Dialogue

In Year Four, Mr. Welling made no visit to the Project, but through correspondence he continued to offer guidance and support. In his correspondence in December of 1982, he indicated that our work to define

culturally appropriate models of development was likely to be of lasting benefit to the Foundation and to other agencies engaged in educational development projects. He expressed interest in hearing of the responses we were receiving from such agencies. He responded with enthusiasm to our prospectus for the African workshop and expressed hope that this workshop would address the "most challenging aspect of [disadvantaged groups] planning for change. . . .Their determination to define and assess their own cultural traditions, often already disappearing."

In June of 1983, Dr. Wood and Dr. Marta Arango visited the Project to discuss matters related to publication. They represented the Foundation in negotiations concerning distribution of royalties generated from the sale of Project volumes. A formula was agreed upon by which royalties would be divided between authors and a fund at the Harvard Graduate School of Education to promote the study of human potential. Originally the fund was to be used for student research. However, based on the success of the course on human potential which Dr. White taught in the fifth year, it was decided that the fund would more effectively promote student interest in the topic through support of the course.

Later, in the Summer and early Fall of 1983, Dr. White and Mr. Welling renegotiated the time-line and budget for the last year of the Project: The Project would remain in operation until August 31, 1984, to allow adequate time and support for the review and revision of manuscripts. Those manuscripts would be completely drafted by the original termination date of February 1984. The budget for the Fifth Year was reduced to accommodate international exchange rate losses.

Year Five: Writing, Review, and Dissemination

A. Overview

In September of 1983, Professor Scheffler's manuscript (Volume I) was sent to the Foundation. Professor LeVine's and Dr. White's manuscript (Volume III) followed in February of 1984. Forum meetings were held over the course of the year to discuss these manuscripts and their subsequent revision. By the end of the Project, in late August of 1984, plans were being made with Routledge and Kegan Paul to publish these Volumes and Volume IV, the case-study anthology.

In March of 1984, Dr. Welling visited the Project to learn of our progress and to initiate discussions of "Volume Zero," a synthetic volume oriented specifically to policymakers and practitioners. With him was Dr. Leo Fernig, a consultant to the Foundation, who had attended the July 1982 meetings in the Hague and who had expressed interest in our Project through correspondence. Dr. Welling and the Project Principals sought to convince Dr. Fernig to serve as the author of Volume Zero. By the end of the meetings in March, Dr. Fernig accepted. In May of 1984, he returned to the Project to discuss his outline for that volume.

Throughout the year, dissemination activities continued in the form of meetings, paper publication, and paper presentations at conferences and colloquia. Dr. Gardner's book, the first to be published, received substantial media attention at home and abroad.

Interest in human potential at the Harvard Graduate School of Education was promoted through the teaching of the Project course in the Spring of 1984. The course was taught by Dr. White and featured guest lectures by Project Principals, Dr. Sanneh, and a panel of scholars concerned with international development. Response to the course was enthusiastic: although the course, which was designed as a graduate seminar, could only accommodate 12 students, 75 attempted to enroll. Next year the course will be offered to a larger group as a lecture course. Ms. Pollak will serve as a teaching assistant to Dr. White.

The final months of the Project were spent revising Volume I, soliciting critiques from outside readers of Volume III, and making decisions regarding the content of Volume IV. Major Project papers were collected and organized for the Project's Archives and several of those papers were submitted to ERIC (Educational Research Information Center) to facilitate public access. Finally, the files were scoured and memories

jogged to produce this History.

B. Volume I: Discussion and Revision

Several Forum meetings during the fifth year were devoted to discussion of Volume I. In the first of these meetings, in October of 1983, Professor Scheffler responded to concern that his philosophical work might prove to be unlikely reading for policy makers, who were described as busy, distracted by "real world" concerns, and more accustomed to reading reports and summaries than philosophical treatises. Professor Scheffler sought advice from the other Princpals as to whether he should adopt the goal of being widely read by policy makers "in the field," and therefore alter his style and content considerably, or whether he might be able to influence policy making with his philosophical work in a less direct fashion. In particular, he suggested that he might seek to influence the <u>training</u> of policy makers through his development of a "practical theory." This latter approach, he said, might be compared to curriculum modification in medical schools as a way of ultimately influencing the practice of medicine. Dr. Gardner and others agreed with this approach in Professor Scheffler's work and advised him to feel no constraint in style beyond assuring that the book will be accessible to the intelligent non-specialist.

Professor Scheffler reported at Forum on the contrasting opinions offered by his readers. Carlos Vasco, a Colombian mathematician, was favorably impressed by the manuscript but warned Professor Scheffler that it would be criticized by the existentialists in Latin America, as they do not accept the notion of human nature. On their view, existence precedes essence: man makes himself through his choices. Professor Scheffler agreed that the choices humans make distinguish them from one another in important ways, but argued that this fact itself implies that choice remains at the core of human existence.

Harry Broudy, an American philosopher of education, offered the opposite critique, claiming that the work on human nature was too individualistic. This critique, however, was more pragmatically motivated than the existentialist critique. How, Professor Broudy asked, can individuals be treated as "ends in themselves" on the level of policy making? While Professor Scheffler acknowledged that the amount of attention that can be paid to individual persons and their situations is indeed limited, he felt that the Kantian view is, in fact, useful, both in explaining our intuitions regarding human dignity and as a guide to fostering dignity. For example, we may interact with a bank

teller qua bank teller, i. e. as one who plays a particular role and whose personal situation is irrelevant. Yet, we acknowledge the person behind the role when we interact in a polite manner. While intuitions are not so clearly buttressed by simple social conventions in the context of policy making, in that context, as in parenting, one can accord respect and dignity, even in the context of acknowledged dependence. For example, one can learn what is wanted; offer reasons why those wants may or may not be fulfilled; and, most generally, one can make decisions which will ultimately contribute to the outgrowing of the dependent relationship.

Another reader, Catherine Elgin, suggested that Professor Scheffler make clear the distinction between respecting the reasoning of another person and agreement with his or her conclusion.

Professor Broudy criticized the degree of relativity accorded to notions of human potential, which he felt would be viewed as paralyzing: How can every contextual feature be analyzed and evaluated? Professor Scheffler agreed that some parameters must be considered provisionally fixed while the possibilitity of changing others is considered. However, no parameter is so firmly fixed that it is exempt from the possibility of

change. Radical thinking must remain a possibility. Certainly his own views of human nature are to be considered susceptible to review in the face of contrary evidence. Throughout discussions with Professor LeVine and others, Professor Scheffler held to the view that his claims regarding human nature, while not strictly deducible from empirical evidence, were based in individual and societal experience and therefore, at least in principle, revisable.

Two readers, Catherine Elgin and Vernon Howard, criticized Professor Scheffler's emphasis on decision making in self development. They pointed out that many major developments in a person's life, e. g., their choice of career, do not come about through a single conscious decision, but result from a number of smaller, less significant decisions.

Professor Scheffler responded that he does not claim that all actions result from conscious decisions. Rather, he asserts a conditional: If a person has a capability and decides to exercise it, he will. This is a conditional definition of capability, not a description of the means by which self-development is managed.

Another reader, Jonas Soltis made a similar point

about the model of decision making as an ideal not closely approximated in real life. He remarked that policy is not made as neatly and consciously as one is led to believe in Professor Scheffler's final chapter. As in the case of the individual, many small decisions lead to larger decisions which have never been consciously adopted, analyzed and evaluated. Professor Scheffler agreed that this was the case. In fact, it was one of the problems that he would address, in his revision of the final chapter, "Relevance to Policy," which he renamed "The Education of Policy Makers."

In response to other suggestions made by Project members Professor Scheffler wrote two additional sections during the Summer of 1984. The first provided three examples of the consequences of the myth of absolute fixed potentials.

In the first example, Professor Scheffler discussed David Perkins' work on heuristics. Dr. Perkins argues against the practice in schools of providing numerous problem sets and writing assignments for the exercise and development of existing skills, while neglecting the development, through heuristics, of underlying "thinking skills." Professor Scheffler concurred with Dr. Perkins that it is fallacious to assume that the thinking strategies which children develop on their own are

unalterable, and therefore "fix" their potential. This fallacy is one consequence of the myth of "fixed" potential.

A second consequence is the stereotyping of ability according to race, class and gender. In classical times some humans were considered, by nature, slaves: that was their fixed potential. In modern democratic societies we eschew such classification, yet, for example, girls are still judged, based on test scores, to be deficient in mathematical potential. This judgment reflects an uncritical adoption of the myth of fixed potential, and neglects the effect of negative expectations regarding mathematical achievement by girls. Such expectations may "fix" the potential; but the expectation, and thus the potential and its ultimate realization are subject to alteration.

In his third example, Professor Scheffler discussed the tendency to design curriculum as if it were to reflect basic fixed domains of potential. This attitude circumvents conscious value decisions concerning the skills and subject matter to be promoted.

The second additional section that Professor Scheffler wrote in the Summer of 1984 served to elaborate more fully his ideological stance on

education. This section, on the democratic ideals of education, supplemented his more individualistic work on human nature.

These additional sections were well received by Project members. However, Professor Scheffler and his editor at Basic Books had editorial disagreements which led to the placement of Professor Scheffler's volume and Volumes III and IV with another publisher, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

C. Volume II: Publicity and Follow-up

Frames of Mind was well received and generated substantial media attention nationally and internationally. It was awarded First Prize as the best book of 1983 by the American Psychological Association. It was reviewed in over thirty publications including: The New York Times, The New York Review of Books, Psychology Today, The Guardian, The Financial Times, Observer Review, New Scientist, El Pais, Veja, and the Times Literary Supplement. Several national television programs including the CBS Morning News, the Today Show, and Health Beat, devoted segments to discussions of Frames of Mind which featured interviews with Dr. Gardner. Dr. Gardner is currently working with the British Broadcasting Company to produce an eight-part

series on human talents, which will present many of the ideas embodied in the theory of multiple intelligences.

Overall, the reviews were very positive. The use of cross-cultural data for support and illustration of the theory was viewed as enriching, as was the broadening of the domain of intelligence to include competencies normally neglected by psychologists. The popularity of the theory on a more emotional level derived from its rejection of the practice of labelling children as "smart" or "dumb" along a single dimension. The multiple intelligences theory allows for a variety of profiles of intelligence: weaknesses in some areas may be accompanied by strengths in others. This aspect of the theory was particularly attractive to educators, whose intuitions and experience show children to be quite different from one another, and who are, therefore, dissatisfied with what they call "lip service" from psychologists concerning individual differences.

Some psychologists, on the other hand, criticized the theory, claiming that intelligence-testing data does not support the view that competence in the different intelligences varies significantly within individuals. Those data reveal a moderately high correlation among intelligences. While it deals with only three of Dr.

Gardner's intelligences: linguistic, logical-mathematical, and spatial, it is these intelligences, the critics argue, that are most plausibly called intelligences; the others, they claim, are not intelligences, but traits or skills. Dr. Gardner's most vocal critic, cognitive psychologist, Robert Sternberg, argues that data on intelligence testing can only be accounted for by positing a general intelligence.

In response to these critics, Dr. Gardner claims that intelligence testing yields correlations among the domains because it employs paper-and-pencil tests, a mode not appropriate to all domains. Thus, what may appear to be a "general intelligence" could actually reduce to test-taking ability. Our society has, through its over use of paper and pencil testing, elevated this ability to a general, in fact, a single, intelligence. It is this mode of achievement that Dr. Gardner would like to see taken from its pedestal in Western education.

Another common criticism of the MI theory is that it is not really a testable theory, but rather, a gathering of suggestive anecdotal and observational evidence. Dr. Gardner views his theory as supported by much evidence (as presented in the book) and he hopes it

will derive additional support from the measurement of distinguishable differences across domains, within subjects. Dr. Gardner is currently involved in developing methods for evaluating the seven intelligences.

During the fifth year of the Project, Dr. Gardner worked with research assistant Mara Krechevsky, and Research Associate, Joseph Walters, to respond to questions raised by reviewers, and to carry out pilot research on the development of intelligence in math, science, and music. These studies were to serve as models for future research. They focussed on giftedness and utilized teachers as a source of information.

Future research on the development and assessment of the intelligences described in Frames of Mind, will be carried out by Dr. Gardner and his colleague from Tufts University, David Feldman. This research will be supported by the Spencer Foundation.

In February of 1984, Dr. Gardner travelled to the Hague to present his work to the Board of Directors and to the Staff of the Bernard van Leer Foundation.

D. Volume III: Writing, Discussion and Revision

During Year Four, Forum discussions of Volume III focussed on individual chapters. During Year Five, as all chapters became available, Forum members also addressed questions concerning the overall structure and logic of the book.

Dr. Gardner and Professor Lesser expressed concern that the basic argument of the book might be difficult to discern, given the diversity of topics treated. They suggested that the main points in each chapter be highlighted, and their place in the central argument clarified.

Dr. Lesser also criticized the discussions of the limitations of current models of educational development. He noted that while economic models are widely used in formulating policy, policy makers are not a homogenous group. Some are very concerned with cultural traditions.

Dr. White agreed, remarking that some policy makers who served as Project consultants were quite knowledgable about and concerned with cultural values. Yet these individuals agreed that economic models are dominant and that alternatives are needed. Volume III offers directions in the formulation of those

alternative models.

Several Forum members felt that the second chapter, which treated educational mobilization in Japan, presented Japan as a "successful" case. They questioned whether this could be supported in view of the "alternative pathways" theme of the cross-cultural work. Dr. White responded that the Japanese case did provide an especially instructive model for policy makers, not because it pursued and achieved a universally valid end, but because its means took account of indigenous concepts and cultural tradition; its development proceeded in concert with its pre-modern conditions and values. If policy makers attend more closely to the historical and cultural pre-conditions of modernity, they will, in fact, promote development along "alternative pathways." In their writing, Professor LeVine and Dr. White clarified the distinction between Japan as a model for ends, and Japan as a model for means. They also reorganized the chapters, placing the chapter on Japan with the other case material after the "core chapter", Chapter 3.

In its final form, the overall content and structure of Volume III is as follows: Chapter 1 critiques current models of educational development and motivates concern for cultural factors. Chapter 2

presents agrarian models of the family. Chapter 2 discusses shifts from these models to modern models of the family and childhood. Chapter 3 describes pre-modern schooling. Together, these chapters document the variety of models and means for the realization of human potential that existed before the spread of Western schooling.

The second major section of the volume, chapters 5-7, present the variety of methods, models, and values associated with education in contemporary contexts: particularly, in Japan, China, and in partly mobilized Third World societies.

Chapter 8 describes the social and psychological costs of educational mobilization, with emphasis on its impact on women's lives. While these costs accrue to both men and women, women are particularly affected by conflicts of expectation and identity: the modern Western school creates expectations of equality in the work world, while the larger societal context remains discriminatory. Moreover, the ideology of the school promotes options at the expense of ligatures - a value at variance with traditional cultural values, especially as they shape women's identities and means of fulfillment.

The concluding chapter summarizes and reinforces the basic argument of the book: that educational policy must take account of the cultural and historical traditions of the people whose "realization of potential" is to be promoted: An examination of these traditions reveals the diversity of methods and goals for the realization of potential.

E. Volume IV

During Year Five, Dr. White and Ms. Pollak selected and edited papers to be published in Volume IV, entitled: The Cultural Transition: Human Experience and Social Transformation in the Third World and Japan. They organized the papers by topic, into three sections.

The first section deals with culture as viewed from the perspective of religion and healing. The papers are: "Psychotherapy and Culture: Healing in the Indian Tradition," by Sudhir Kakar, "Source and Influence: A Comparative Approach to African Religion and Culture," by Lamin Sanneh, "Healing and Transformation: Perspectives on Education, Development and Community," by Richard Katz, and "Social Change and Personal Crisis: A View from an Indian Practice," by B.K. Ramanujam.

The second section discusses diverse methods and ideologies of schooling and raises issues of the transferability of forms of schooling across cultural boundaries. The papers are: "The Making of a Fqih: The Transformation of Traditional Islamic Teachers in Modern Cultural Adaptation," by Daniel Wagner and Jennifer Spratt, "Cultural Continuity in an Educational Institution: A Case Study of the Suzuki Method of Music Instruction," by Lois Taniuchi, and "Learning Elementary School Mathematics as a Culturally Conditioned Process," by Carlos Eduardo Vasco.

The third section presents diverse cultural conceptions of the person and the life course. The papers are: "'Heart' and Self in Old Age: A Chinese Model," by Julia Shiang, "The Work of Mourning: Death in a Punjabi Family," by Veena Das, "Skills and Life Strategies of Japanese Business Women," by Sumiko Iwao, and "Selfhood in Context: Some Indian Solutions," by Prakash Desai and Alfred Collins.

VII. Conclusion

In 1979, the Project Principals viewed the concept of human potential as a murky, vaguely disreputable concept. None would have written a grant proposal, unprompted, to examine issues of the realization of human potential. Even when prompted, by Dean Ylvisaker and his colleagues in Holland, there was some hesitation, and even in the first year of the Project, the question was raised: Ought we dispense with the concept all together in favor of concepts we understand, like development and cognition?

Happily, the challenge was met head-on. The concept of potential is, in fact, centrally employed in the world of policy making. If we, in the academic world were to put our knowledge to use in that world, it was imperative that we come to understand the concept: its use and misuse.

The generality of the concept was found to be its strength and its weakness. It was a strength insofar as it provided a topic for dialogue of breadth and depth concerning the goals of human life, the means by which these goals are achieved, and the diverse cultural settings through which those goals and means are defined.

It was a weakness insofar as it resisted focussed scholarly inquiry. In fact, the concept of potential has been rejected by theoretical science as a pseudo-explanation. Upon analysis of its continued use in educational policy and practice, we found that assertions and denials of potential left many important questions unanswered: By what criteria do we deny or affirm potential? What are our underlying assumptions about progress and fulfillment? What values underly our willingness to view one potential as fixed and another as alterable? Moreover, we found that the concept, as it is used in the West, harbors ethnocentric myths, e.g. that potentials reside in individuals, to be objectively assessed and measured.

On balance, however, we found the strengths to outweigh the weaknesses, and that the concept of potential deserved intense scrutiny. In raising questions concerning the relativity of potential and the multiple means by which it can be realized, the Project has, we hope, provided new perspectives of use to policy makers. We hope that those who come to know our work are influenced to acknowledge diversity among cognitive skills, i.e. to abandon the model of uni-dimensional intelligence as it is promoted through Western schooling. We hope that they will examine and evaluate

the values which underlie their judgments as to which potentials are worth promoting, and in whom. And we hope they will design intervention programs with increased sensitivity to cultural definitions of success and failure, cost and benefit.

While we hope we have influenced our audience, we know we have influenced each other. It is clearly to the detriment of modern higher education that interdisciplinary projects like ours are so rare, and so difficult to conduct productively. But it is a tribute to the wisdom and courage of those at the Foundation to have proposed and supported such an ambitious interdisciplinary venture. Individual scholarly disciplines tend to function somewhat like cultures: certain questions are open, others are closed. In our joint venture we opened new questions for each other. Psychological concepts of development were challenged from the perspective of anthropology. Philosophical concepts of human nature were debated by biologists and anthropologists. The relativity so widely accepted by anthropologists was, in turn, challenged by biological data and through philosophic argument. While the ideas presented in each of the Project volumes represent the views of the author, those ideas were influenced by the interdisciplinary Forum in which they were conceived and tested. None of the Project volumes could have emerged

in their current form from isolated ivory towers.

While the Project closes with a sense of satisfaction that five years were well spent, we must view our work as a beginning. There is much work to be done: to test the theory of multiple intelligences; to expand our knowledge of the diversity of contexts in which human potential can be realized and to better understand why elements in one context may or may not be of benefit in another; to develop models for international development which can accommodate such knowledge; to redefine goals of education to promote diverse skills and to contribute to fulfillment in the personal and cultural context; to modify the training of policy makers and the models they employ to make questions of culture and ethics central (rather than peripheral and irksome); and, most generally, to encourage the new generation of academicians, policy makers, and practitioners, to cross boundaries, cultural and intellectual, to seek and provide for the mutual illumination required for a greater understanding of human potential and its realization.

APPENDIX A

PEOPLE INVOLVED WITH THE PROJECT ON HUMAN POTENTIAL

Contents

1. Principal Investigators (includes biographical sketches)
2. Steering Committee
3. Staff
   A. Research
   B. Administrative
   C. Secretarial
   D. Library Assistants
4. Scholars-in-Residence
5. Participants in Case Studies
   A. China
   B. Japan
   C. India
   D. Latin America
   E. Egypt
   F. Africa
6. Advisors
   A. American
   B. International
7. Readers
8. Project Visitors and Consultants
9. Correspondents and People Interviewed by Project Members
10. Corresponding Institutions

1. Principal Investigators

Howard Gardner, Director of Interdisciplinary Research

Howard Gardner is a Lecturer on Education and Senior Research Associate of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, as well as Co-Director of Harvard Project Zero, a long-term basic research group which focuses on questions of human symbol use with special attention to artistic knowledge. He is also currently a research psychologist at Boston Veterans Administration Medical Center, and Professor of Neurology at Boston University School of Medicine. He has received several research grants as well as a MacArthur Prize Fellowship. His research is concerned with the development and breakdown of symbolization skills in normal and gifted children and in brain-damaged adults. His publications include: The Quest for Mind: Jean Piaget, Claude Lévi-Strauss, and the Structuralist Movement (1973); second edition, 1981); The Shattered Mind: The Person After Brain Damage (1975); Developmental Psychology: An Introduction (1978; second edition, 1982); Artful Scribbles: The Significance of Children's Drawings (1980); Art, Mind, and Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity (1982); and his Project volume, Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (1983).

Harry M. Lasker, Project Director 1979-1981, Associate Director 1981-1982

Harry Lasker was a Lecturer on Education and Research Associate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education from 1972 to 1983. In 1965, he conducted a study of factors affecting response to Achievement Motivation Training in India, and in 1967-68, he conducted a study of the social-psychological and economic factors underlying innovation in agriculture in rural Thailand. From 1970-1977, he was Director of Research at the Humanas Foundation, Willemstad, Curacao, and has been Consultant on Organizational Development for the Royal Dutch Shell Company in Curacao. His most recent publication is: Lasker, H.M., and Moore, J.F. Current Studies of Adult Development: Implications for Education. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education (1979).
In 1981, he co-founded Interactive Training Systems where he now serves as Vice President of

Educational Development.

Gerald Lesser, Steering Committee and Forum Chairman

Gerald Lesser is Bigelow Professor of Education and Developmental Psychology at Harvard Graduate School of Education and Chairman of the Board of Advisors of the Children's Television Workshop. He received his Ph.D. in Psychology from Yale University in 1952. With the Children's Television Workshop, he was a principal architect in the creation of Sesame Street and The Electric Company. He taught at Adelphi University and Hunter College of the City University of New York, was Visiting Professor at the Danish National Institute for Education Research (1965-66) and a Guggenheim Fellow (1970-71). In 1974, he received the American Psychological Association's Distinguished Contribution Award for Applications in Psychology. His publications include Children and Television: Lessons from Sesame Street. His research interests include the cross-cultural analysis of adolescent development, the study of the effects of different cultural backgrounds upon the development of abilities in children and the effects of the visual media upon children.

Robert A. LeVine, Director, Cross-cultural Group

Robert LeVine is Roy E. Larsen Professor of Education and Human Development at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University. He has conducted field research in Kenya and Nigeria, having received his Ph.D. in Social Anthropology at Harvard in 1958. His honors and fellowships include Fellow at Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (1971-72), NIMH Research Scientist Award (1972-76), and President of the Society for Psychological Anthropology (1980-81). He was Chairman of the Social Science Research Council's Board of Directors from 1980 to 1983. From 1977-1980 he was Chairman of the Laboratory of Human Development. His publications include LeVine, Nyansongo: A Gusii community in Kenya (1966), Dreams and Deeds: Achievement and Motivation in Nigeria (1966), Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behavior (1972), Culture, Behavior and Personality (1973); and his project volume, co-authored with Merry I. White, Human Conditions: The Cultural Basis of Educational Development, to be published in 1985.

Israel Scheffler, Senior Advisor

Israel Scheffler is Victor S. Thomas Professor of Education and Philosophy at Harvard University. At the Harvard Graduate School of Education he co-directs the Philosophy of Education Research Center. His special interests are the philosophy of language, the philosophy of science, and the philosophy of education. His writings include The Language of Education (1960); the Anatomy of Inquiry (1963); Conditions of Knowledge (1965); Science and Subjectivity (1967); Reason and Teaching (1973); Four Pragmatists (1974); Beyond the Letter (1979); and his Project volume, Of Human Potential: An Essay in the Philosophy of Education, to be published in 1985.

Merry I. White, Consultant (1979-1980), Case Study Coordinator (1980-1981), Associate Director (1981-1982), Project Director (1982-1984)

Merry White teaches at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and is administrator of the Committee on the A. B. Degree in East Asian Studies at Harvard University. She received her Ph.D. from the Department of Sociology, Harvard University, in 1980. She received the Danforth Graduate Fellowship for Women (1973-1977) and grants from the National Institutes for Mental Health, as well as a Harvard Foreign Languages Area Scholarship. Her writings include Stranger in his Native Land, a study of the internationalization of Japanese education (forthcoming); "Japanese Education: How They Do It" in The Public Interest, Summer, 1984; and other articles and book reviews. She is also editor of the Proceedings of the InternationalSymposium on Women's Roles, Tokyo, 1978, as well as the Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium,1983, and has participated in many workshops and conferences on education, women's roles, and the psychology of the self in Japan. Her special interests include research on learning and motivation in China, India, and Japan, and she is currently establishing a research program on Japanese and American education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Her Project volumes are: Human Conditions: The Cultural Basis of Educational Development, co-edited with Robert LeVine, and The Cultural Transition: Human Experience and Social Transformation in the Third World and Japan, co-edited with Susan Pollak, they will be published in 1985.

2. Steering Committee

Howard E. Gardner, Senior Research Associate in Education and Co-Director of Harvard Project Zero

Francis Keppel, Senior Lecturer on Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Harry M. Lasker, Lecturer on Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Gerald S. Lesser, Chairman of the Steering Committee, Bigelow Professor of Education and Developmental Psychology, Harvard Graduate School of Education, and Director of the Center for Research in Children's Television

Robert A. LeVine, Roy Larsen Professor of Education and Human Development, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Israel Scheffler, Thomas Professor of Education and Philosophy, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Merry I. White, Lecturer on Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Blenda J. Wilson, Lecturer on Education and Senior Associate Dean of the Faculty of Education

3. Staff

A. Research

Lisa Brooks, genetics

Thomas Carothers, political science

Elizabeth Fine, international development

Paul Fulton, education

Suzy Q. Groden, linguistics

Kenneth Hawes, philosophy

Suzanne Kirschner, psychology and anthropology

Mara Krechevsky, cognitive psychology

William Kuni[illegible], biology

Linda Levine, philosophy and psychology

Raul Magana, anthropology (post-doctoral Fellow in human development)

Susan McConnell, neurobiology

James F. Moore, psychology

Shelagh O'Rourke, anthropology

Erin Phelps, psychology

Susan Pollak, education, philosophy, and history and co-editor of project volume, The Cultural Transition: Human Experience and Social Transformation in the Third World and Japan

Julia Shiang, human development

William Skryzniarz, international development

Claudia Strauss, anthropology

Sara Taber, human development

Lois Taniuchi, human development, Japanese studies

Susan Templeton, human development

Eftihia Voutira, philosophy

Joseph Walters, research methods in education

Paul Zavitkovsky, clinical psychology and anthropology

B. Administrative

Leonie Gordon, Research Coordinator

Margaret Herzig, Research Coordinator

William J. Skrzyniarz, Administrative Assistant

C. Secretarial

Dorothy Appel

Rosalie Daylor

Denize Zero

D. Library Assistants

Ross Corson

Steve Defeo

Naomi Dinces

Alice Finn

Nancy Hagan

William Huang

Roberta Williams

4. Scholars-in-Residence

David Feldman, developmental psychology, Tufts University

Sumiko Iwao, social psychology, Keio University, Tokyo

Sudhir Kakar, psychoanalyst, New Delhi

B. K. Ramanujam, psychiatry, New York City

5. Participants in Case Studies

A. People's Republic of China

Fang Xuanchu, Director
The Preparatory Group for the Study of Rencai ("human talent"), Beijing

Deborah Davis-Friedmann, sociology, Yale University

Professor Fei Xiaotong, Director
The Institute of Sociology, Beijing

Julia Shiang, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Xia Shuzhang, Vice-Rector, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou

B. Japan

Michiko Fukazawa, therapist, St. Marianna University Hospital

Eishun Hamaguchi, sociology, Osaka University

Akira Hoshino, psychology, International Christian Jniversity, Tokyo

Tadashi Inoue, psychology, Keio University

Sumiko Iwao, social psychology and communications, Keio University, Tokyo

Shigefumi Nagano, developmental psychology, National Institute of Educational Research, Tokyo

Mikihachiro Tatara, psychology Hiroshima University

Yuichi Yamada, Industrial psychology, Meiji University

C. India

Anandalakshmy, child development, Lady Irwin College, New Delhi

Prakash Desai, psychiatrist, Chicago

Erna Hoch, clinical psychologist, Kashmir

Sudhir Kakar, psychoanalyst, New Delhi

McKim Marriott (organizer), anthropology, University of Chicago

B. K. Ramanujam, psychiatry, New York City

A. K. Ramanujam, linguistics, poetry, literature, University of Chicago

Alan Roland, psychotherapist, New York City

D. Mexico

Juan Acha, art and psychology, Mexico City

Marta Arango, sociology, Van Leer Foundation Project, Bogota & Medellin

Carlos Garcia, sociology, Monterey

Luis Gonzales, CIIDET, Queretaro

Carlos Corona Ibarra, psychoanalyst University of Guadalajara

Juan Lafarga, psychologist, Mexico City

Magdalena de Leon Leal, sociology, Colombia

Raul Magana, anthropology, CIIDET, Queretaro

Tomas Miklos, Director of the Foundacion Barros Sierra, Mexico City

Ezequiel Nieto, CIIDET, Queretaro

Glen Nimnicht, educational development, Bogota, Columbia

Mariano Ortega, sociology, CIIDET, Queretaro

Jose Pliego, city planner, Guadalajara

Josefina Quintanilla, gerontologist, Monterey

Carlos Eduardo Vasco, mathematician, Javeriana University Bogota, Colombia

E. Egypt

Roshdy Fam, sociology, Ainshams University, Cairo

Faraq Ahmed Faraq, Chairman, psychology, Ainshams University

Kadri Hefny, psychology, Ainshams University

Youssef Kotb, director of Science Education, former President of Ainshams University

Ibrahim Madkaour, head of Arab Academy, Cairo, philosophy and Islam

Asaad Nadim, anthropology, American University, Cairo; editor, Social Science Report

Nawal El-Messiri Nadim, anthropology, American University, Cairo

Diana de Treville, anthropologist, AID Project Officer

F. Africa

Amechi Anumonye, psychiatry, Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Lagos, Nigeria

Cheikh Ba, social geography, University of Dakar, Senegal

Christopher Bakare, education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Boubacar Barry, history, University of Dakar, Senegal

Kadja Mianno Daniel, Director, Institute of Ethnosociology, Abidjan, Ivory Coast

Felicia Ekejiuba, anthropology,and sociology, University of Nsukka, Nigeria

Lamin Sanneh, Harvard Divinity School

6. Advisors

A. American Board

Philip G. Altbach, higher education and foundations of education, State University of New York, Buffalo

Mary Jo Bane, public policy, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Orville G. Brim, Jr., President of the Foundation of Child Development, New York City

Norman Geschwind, neurology, Harvard Medical School

James Lowell Gibbs, anthropology, Stanford University

Thomas F. Green, education and co-director of the Educational Policy Research Center, Syracuse University

Bernice L. Neugarten, human development, Northwestern University

Prof. Seizaburo Sato, political science, Tokyo University

Ezra Vogel, sociology, and East Asian Studies, Harvard University

B. International Advisors

Laila Abu-Lughod, anthropology, Williams College

David Burleson, Sr. Liaison, UNICEF-UNESCO, N.Y.

His Excellency Mr. Bakary Darbo, Vice President, The Gambia

Veena Das, sociology, University of Delhi

Takeo Doi, psychoanalyst, National Institute of Mental Health, Tokyo

Hiroko Hara, anthropology, Tokyo

Taizo Kato, sociology, Waseda University

Florence Mahoney, Banjul

Shib Mitra, psychoanalyst, Director of National Center for Educational Research and Training, New Delhi

Chie Nakane, anthropology, Tokyo University

Sammy Palmer, physician, Banjul

Seizaburo Sato, political science, Tokyo University

Mona Seragaldin, regional planner, consultant to AID

Soedjatmoko, Rector, Tokyo University

7. Readers

a. Scheffler's Of Human Potential

Harry S. Broudy, philosophy of education, University of Illinois

Catherine Z. Elgin, philosophy, University of North Carolina

Thomas Green, education, Syracuse University

Vernon Howard, Co-Director, Harvard Philosophy of Education Research Center

David Perkins, psychology, Co-Director, Harvard Project Zero

Jonas Soltis, philosophy of education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Carlos Vasco, mathematician, Javeriana University, Bogota, Colombia

b. Gardner's Frames of Mind

Thomas Carothers, London School of Economics

Michael Cole, psychology, University of California, San Diego

Yadin Dudai, neurobiology, The Weizmann Institute of Science

David Feldman, developmental psychology, Tufts University

Norman Geschwind, neurology, Harvard Medical School

David Olson, developmental and educational psychology, Ontario Insitute for Studies in Education

Sidney Strauss, educational psychology, Tel Aviv

W.D. Wall, former Scientific Advisor, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Ellen Winner, developmental psychologist, Boston College

c. LeVine's and White's Human Conditions

Norberto Bottani, child development and education, OECD, Paris

John Demos, psychology and history, Brandeis University

Leo Fernig, EDUCONSULT, Geneva

Bob Myers, expert on Latin America, Ford Foundation

Paul Streeten, economics, Boston University

David Szanton, expert on Southeast Asia, Social Science Research Council, New York

W. D. Wall, former Scientific Advisor, Bernard van Leer Foundation

8. Project Visitors and Consultants

Jacob Ajayi, history, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Chris Argyris, education and organizational behavior, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Ali Banouazzizi, social psychology, Boston College

James Botkin, Author of the Club of Rome's No Limit to Learning

Elise Boulding, sociology, Dartmouth College

Stanley Brandes, anthropology, University of California at Berkeley

Dan Brown, psychology, Cambridge Hospital

Kath Browning, education, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

Jerome Bruner, psychology, Harvard University

Michael Burton, anthropology, University of California, Irvine

Ching Chi-Chen, psychology, People's Republic of China

Robert Chin, social psychology, Boston University

Noam Chomsky, linguistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Michael Cole, psychology, University of California, San Diego

Samuel Coleman, anthropology, North Carolina State University, JAPAN Center

Laurel Cornell, social anthropology, University of Pittsburgh

David Court, African education, Rockefeller Foundation and Harvard Institute for International Development

Dan Ran Mao, East China Normal University, Shanghai

Deborah Davis-Friedman, sociology, Yale University

Gilbert de Landesheere, child development, consultant to Bernard van Leer Foundation

Diana Eck, comparative religion, Harvard Divinity School

Jack Easley, science and math education, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana

Barbro Ek, Center for Middle Eastern Studies,

Harvard University

Aziz Esmail, Middle Eastern Studies and World Religions, Harvard University

Ian Clifton Everest, former Scientific Associate, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Fei Xiaotong, anthropology and sociology, Institute of Social Sciences, People's Republic of China

Leo Fernig, EDUCONSULT, Geneva

Kurt Fischer, cognitive psychology, University of Denver

William Fowler, developmental psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

H.C. Garguli, psychology, University of Delhi

Norman Geschwind, neurology, Harvard Medical School

William Graham, comparative religion, Harvard University

D.R.B. Grant, head of the Center for Childhood Education, University of West Indies, Jamaica, consultant to Bernard van Leer Foundation

Rachel Hare-Mustin, China specialist, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Charlotte Ikels, anthropology, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Elliot Jacques, sociology, Brunce University, England

Cigdem Kagitcibasi, social psychology, Boğaziçi University, Turkey

Richard Katz, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Kenneth King, African area specialist IDRC, Ottawa

Dorinne Kondo, anthropology, Harvard University

Catherine Lutz, anthropology, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Malcolm MacPherson, agricultural economy, Harvard Institute for International Development

Tomas Miklos, former Director of the Fundacion Barro Sierra, Mexico City

Franz Monks, psychology; University of Nijmegen, consultant to Bernard van Leer Foundation

Roy Mottahedeh, Center for Middle East Studies, Princeton University

Hiromitsu Muta, National Institute for Educational Research, Tokyo

Naotada Nakajima, educational sociology, Institute for the Study of Entrance Examinations, Tokyo

David Olson, developmental and educational psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Katherine Pyne Parsons, philosophy, Smith College

Hugh Philp, School of Education, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia; consultant to Bernard van Leer Foundation

David Plath, anthropology, University of Illinois

Gavriel Salomon, psychology and media, Hebrew University

Tokue Shibata, urban sociologist, Metro Urban Research Center, Tokyo

Sing-chu Tseng, psychology, Shanghai Normal University

Sir Hugh Springer, former Secretary General of the Association of Commonwealth Universities

Paul Streeten, international development economics, Boston University

A. van Dantzig, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Oscar van Leer, former Chairman, Board of Trustees, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Chris A.O. van Nieuwenhuijze, sociology, The Hague

Suzanne Vogel, psychiatric social worker, Harvard University, Health Services

Daniel Wagner, Director of the Literacy Center, University of Pennsylvania

W. D. Wall, former Scientific Advisor, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Willem Welling, Executive Director, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Eleanor Westney, organizational sociologist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A. W. Wood, Chief of Operations and Programme Services, Bernard van Leer Foundation

Wu Chen-I, psychiatry, Beijing An-Ding Hospital, People's Republic of China

Wu Fu-neng, President, Shangdung University

Xia Shuzhang, Zhongshan University and Harvard University

Xu Fuji, Vice President, Nanjing University

Paul Ylvisaker, Professor and former Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Yue Daiyun, comparative literature, Beijing University

Zhao Fusan, Deputy Secretary and Foreign Relations Chairman, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, People's Republic of China

9. Correspondents and People Interviewed by Project Members

Mansoor Ahmed, UNICEF, New York

Chaim Adler, sociology, Hebrew University

Stephen Albert, composer, Boston

Eduardo Aldana, Social Research Center (SER), former head of Universidad de los Andes

Abebe Ambatchew, African Program, United Nations Development Program

Ronald Aqua, Social Science Research Council

David Auerbach, philosophy, North Carolina

State University

Dorothea Banks, UNICEF, New York

Solon Barraclough, UN Research Institute for Social Development

S. Biesheuvel, University of Witwaterstrand, South Africa

Larry Benowitz, neurobiology, McLean Hospital, Waltham, Massachusetts

Ed Berman, Van Leer England Project on Children's Games

A. Bertels, Programme Specialist, UNESCO

Gabriel Betancourt, Former Minister of Education, former UNESCO official

Ned Block, philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Michael H. Bond, psychology, Chinese University (Hong Kong)

Ladislav Cerych, Institute of Education, University of Paris

Francisco Cobos, child psychology, Colombia

Susan Cochrane, Population and Human Resources Division, World Bank

Josh Cohen, philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Alfred Collins, Indian studies and clinical psychology, University of Chicago

Mihaly Csikszentmihaly, psychology, University of Chicago

Alfredo Maximo Cuellar, Visiting Professor at Harvard Graduate School of Education from Mexico

William Damon, developmental psychology, Clark University

David Davies, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Aracelly de Tezanos de Manana, psychology, Centro

de Investijacion de la Universidad Pedagogica Nacional, Bogota

O. Dewal, Open School, Delhi

Takeo Doi, psychoanalyst, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, Tokyo

Ronald Dore, sociology, Institute for Development Studies, Sussex

Alan Dundas, anthropology, University of California Berkeley

Richard Durstine, AEPED, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

S.N. Eisenstadt, sociology, Hebrew University

Ray Elliot, educational psychology, Institute of Education, London

Erik and Joan Erikson, psychoanalysts, Tiburon, California

Hans Eysenck, psychology, Institute of Psychiatry

Fang Xuanchu, Director, the Preparatory Group for the Study of Rencai ("human talent"), Beijing

Josette Feyler, Assistant Director of Primary Education, Canton of Geneva

R. A. Fleming, Liaison Office for UNU (Tokyo) University, New York

Jerry Fodor, philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Brian Foss, developmental psychology, Bedford College, University of London

Hazel Francis, developmental psychology, Institute of Education, University of London

Nelson Goodman, philosophy, Harvard University

Stephen Jay Gould, biology, Harvard University

Howard Gruber, developmental psychology, Rutgers University

Aklilu Habte, director of the Education Division,

World Bank

Wadi Haddad, East African Department of the Education Division, World Bank

Peter Heijmans, social psychology, University of Nijmegen

Daniel Helminiak, theology and psychology, Harvard Divinity School

Ward Heneveld, Aga Khan Foundation, Geneva

Stephen P. Heyneman, sociology, Education Division, World Bank

Colin Hindley, psychiatry, Institute of Education, University of London

Waka Hironaka, Tokyo and Kyoto, Board of Education

Hon-chan Chai, AEPED, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Mary Hollensteiner, UNICEF, New York

Michael Huberman, education, University of Geneva

Robert Hunt, anthropology, Brandeis University

Paul Isenman, chief author of World Development Report, 1980, World Bank

Motonobu Itoh, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology

Richard Johanson, EDC, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Jerome Kagan, psychology, Harvard University

Gerard Kempen, linguistics, University of Nijmegen

Kenneth Keniston, psychology and sociology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Marcel Kinsbourne, neurology, Eunice Shriver Center, Waltham, Massachusetts

Jane Koslowsky, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

T. Adeoye Lambo, Deputy Director, World Health Organization, Geneva

Thierry Lemaresquier, UNICEF, Geneva

Magdalena Leon de Leal, sociology, Bogota

Jerome Lettvin, biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Claude Lévi-Strauss, L'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris

Cornelius van Lieshout, social psychologist, University of Nijmegen

Agustin Lombana, Vice-rector, Javeriana University, comparative education

Bryan Magee, philosopher and political scientist, member of Parliament, London

David Mandelbaum, expert on India, University of California Berkeley

John Marks, behavioral sciences journalist

Alexander Marshack, anthropology, Peabody Museum, Harvard University

Jacques Mehler, cognitive psychologist, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris

Shib Mitra, director, National Center for Educational Research and training, Delhi

Ricardo Moran, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Alistair Mundy-Castle, psychology, University of Lagos

Henry Murray, psychology, Harvard University

Robert Myers, expert on Latin America, Ford Foundation

Ashis Nandy, acting director, Center for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi

Damianos Oden, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Orlando Olcese, African Program, UN Development Program

Daniel Osherson, cognitive science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Nico van Oudenhoven, UNICEF

John Passmore, philosophy, University of Canberra, Australia

Yves Pelle, UNICEF, Geneva

R. S. Peters, philosopher of education, Institute of Education, University of London

Katherine Pfitzer, Aga Khan Foundation, Geneva

Alicia Reichel-Dolmatoff, anthropology, Ministry of Education, Colombia

David Riesman, sociology, Harvard University

Paul Rozin, psychology, University of Pennsylvania

Roberto Ruiz-Esparza, LCPED, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Sumiko Sasanuma, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology

Shinichi Suzuki, developer, Talent Education Program

Judith Jarvis Thomson, philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Tadanobu Tsunoda, Medical Research Institute, Tokyo Medical and Dental University

J.P. White, educational psychology, Institute of Education, University of London

Michael Wilson, EMPED, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Mulugeta Wodajo, EMPED, World Bank, Washington, D. C.

John Womack, history, Harvard University

Professor Wu Fu-heng, President, Shandong University

Yoji Yamamoto, Time-Life Educational Systems Co., Ltd., Tokyo

Zhang Hou-Can, Associate Professor of Psychology, Beijing University

10. Corresponding Institutions

Social Science Research Council
Joint Committee on South Asia
Alternative Psychologies of South Asia
Dr. McKim Marriott, Organizer
Department of Anthropology
University of Chicago

United Nations University
Soedjatmoko, Rector
Programs of Human and Social Development
(Dr. Kinhide Mushakoji, Director)
Tokyo
Japan

Group to Study the Self and Society in Japan
Keio University and International Christian University
Tokyo, Japan

Suzuki Talent Education Institute
Matsumoto, Japan

Center for Developing Societies
Dr. Ashis Nandy, Director
29 Rajpur Road
Delhi
India

National Center for Educational Research and Training
Dr. Shib Mitra, Director
New Delhi, India

The Open School
New Delhi, India

Institute for Psychiatric and Psychosomatic Medicine
Dr. Carlos Corona, Director
University of Guadalajara
Guadalajara, Mexico

Centro Internacional de Educacion y Desarrollo Humano
Medellin, Colombia

The Preparatory Group for the Study of Rencai
Director Fang Xuanchu
People's Republic of China

The Institute of Sociology
Director, Prof. Fei Xiaotong
People's Republic of China

Harvard University research centers:

Center for East Asian Studies
Center for International Affairs
Center for Middle Eastern Studies
Harvard Divinity School
(especially the Project on "Women, Religious Traditions and Social Change")

Ford Foundation - Delhi

Ainshams University, Cairo

CIIDET, Queretaro, Mexico

World Bank, Education Division and Population and Resource Division

UNICEF

UNDP

UNESCO

APPENDIX B

PAPERS
prepared for the

PROJECT ON HUMAN POTENTIAL

Harvard Graduate School of Education

Acha, Juan, "Nuestro Potencial Cognoscitivo de la Realidad Artistica," March 1983

Anandalakshmy, S., "Biographing a Grandfather, Family Reportage and Personal Documents," June, 1982

Anumonye, Amechi, "West African Healing in Mental Health in Urban Area," January, 1983

Arango, Marta and Nimnicht, Glen, "Organizing Environments to enhance the Development of Persons and Communities in Isolated Regions of Colombia: A Challenge to the Development of Human Potential," March 1983*

Ba, Cheikh, "Pedagogy of Nature and Modernization among the Pastoral Socieites of the Peul in Senegal," January 1983

Bakare, Christopher C. M., "The Development of African Children in Early Childhood: The Mother's Role," January 1983

Barry, Boubacar, "The Foundations of Regional Unity in Senegambia During the 15th and 16th Centuries," January 1983

Brooks, Lisa D., "Genetics and Human Populations," June 1980

Carothers, Tom, "Politics, Economics, Culture and Human Potential," June 1980*

Das, Veena, "The Work of Mourning: Death in a Punjabi Family," to appear in The Cultural Transition..... PHP, 1984*

Desai, Prakash and Collins, Alfred, "Selfhood in Context: Some Indian Solutions," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

Desai, Prakash N., "Indian Psychotherapist in Training," June 1982

----------, "Learning Psychotherapy: A Cultural Perspective," June 1982

Davis-Friedmann, Deborah, "Current Chinese Approaches to Issues in Human Development: A Preliminary Foray," December 1980 (Working Draft)

Ekejiuba, Felicia, "At the Frontiers of Change: Patterns of Responses of Nigerian Women to Opportunities and Challenges of Social Change," January 1983

Feldman, David Henry, "Transitions, Transformations, and Human Potential," July 1980*

Fine, Elizabeth, "The Rise of Universal Education in the 19th Century," May 1983

Fulton, Paul R., "Indigenous Psychologies of Self and its Development," May 1983*

Garcia Rivera, Carlos H., "Analisis Comparativo de Los Perfiles de Los Ejecutivos," March 1983

Gardner, Howard, "Towards a More Universal Study of Human Cognitive Development," February 1981 (Working Draft)

----------, "Giftedness, Speculations from a Biological Perspective," January 1982

----------, "The Development of Competence in Culturally-defined Domains." In R. Shweder and R. LeVine (Eds.), The Acquisition of Culture. New York: Cambridge University Press, in press.

----------, "Some Notes on the Development of Symbolic Literacy." In M. Wrolstad, D. Fisher and P. Kolers (Eds.), Toward a Greater Understanding of Literacy. In press.

Gardner, H. and Wolf, D.P. "Waves and Streams of Symbolization." In D.R. Rogers and J.A. Sloboda (Eds.). The Acquisition of Symbolic Skills. London: Plenum Press, 1983.

----------, "The Symbolic Products of Early Childhood." In D. Gorlitz and J. Wohwill (Eds.), Play, Curiosity, and Exploration. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum, in press.

Gardner, H. "Multiple Intelligences." In Practical Intelligence, R. Sternberg & R. Wagner (Eds.) Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Gardner, H., "Assessing Intelligences: A Comment on Testing Intelligence Without IQ Tests." Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1984. (This is a response to R. Sternberg's article, "Testing Intelligence Without IQ Tests.")

Gordon, Leonie, Strauss, Claudia, Taniuchi, Lois and White, Merry; "Workshop on Healing, Personal Transformation and the Life Course in India," June 1982

Gordon, Leonie and White, Merry I.,"China Workshop," May 1982

----------,"Japan Workshop," May 1982

Gordon, Leonie and Staff of Project on Human Potential, "Workshop on African Models of Human Development," January 1983

Gordon, Leonie, "Education in China: Traditional and Modern."

Groden, Suzy Q., "Language, Literacy and the Realization of Human Potential," June 1980

Hoch, Erna M., "Attitudes and Expectations with regard to Health and Healing of Illiterate Mountain Peasants in India," June 1982

Iwao, Sumiko, "Skills and Life Strategies of Japanese Business Women," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

Kadja Mianno, Daniel, "Les Mouvements Religieux en Afrique de de l'Ouest," January 1983

----------, "Une Problematique Sociologique du sens des mouvements religieux en Afrique de l'Ouest (L'Exemple de la Cote d'Ivoire)," November, 1982

Kakar, Sudhir, "Psychotherapy and Culture: Healing in the Indian Tradition," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

----------, "Person and Personal Transformation in Tantra," June 1982

Katz, Richard, "The Education of a Traditional Healer," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, August 1984*

Kirschner, Suzanne, "Ideological Themes in Movements for Child Labor Reform and in the Images of Children in Literature in 19th Century England and America," May 1983*

----------, "The Birth of the Child Study Movement in the U.S.: Some Ideological, Social and Institutional Influence," June 1983*

----------, " 'Le Droit de L'Enfant': Ideologies of the Child in 19th Century French Literature and Child Welfare Reform," June 1983*

----------, "Some Issues in the Historiography of Childhood and Youth," January 1984*

Krechevsky, M., Walters, J., and Gardner, H. "A Study of Musical and Logical-Mathematical Intelligences." 1984.

Kunin, William, "Human Potential and the Nervous System," June 1980

Lafarga, Juan, "El Enfoque Centrado en La Persona En Mexico, Experiencia y Reformulacion," March 1983

Lasker, Harry M., "The Self and Human Potential: A Cross-Cultural and Developmental Analysis," February 1981 (Working Draft)

LeVine, Robert A., "Cultural Variations in Ethnography," January 1981 (Preliminary notes)

----------, "The Social Conditions of Child Development: An Historical and Comparative Perspective," December 1980

----------, "Statement for Workshop on the Anthropology of Human Fertility," February 1981

----------, "The Self in Culture I: Person-Centered Ethnography and Psychoanalytic Anthropology," October 1980*

Lutz, Catherine and LeVine, Robert A., "Culture and Intelligence in Infancy: An Ethnopsychological View," January 1982

Magana, J. Raul, "Formal Methods in Ethnopsychology: A Preliminary Account," September 1980 (Draft)*

Magana, Raul and Pliego, Jose, "Percepcion del Entorno y Participacion de La Comunidad Como Un Enfoque Al Desarro -llo Humano," March 1983

McConnell, Susan, "Two Biological Perspectives on Species-Typical Development," June 1981*

McConnell, Susan, "The Effects of Early Experience on the Brain: Implications for the Study of Human Potential," February 1981

Miklos, Tomas, "Anticipando el Futuro," March 1983

----------, "Potencial Humano," March 1983

Nieto-Cardoso, Ezequiel, "La Investigacion Cientifica y sus Condicionamientos Sociales, Una Introduccion Critica," March 1983

Pollak, Susan, "Traditional Islamic Education," March 1982 (Working Draft)*

----------, "Of Monks and Men: Sacred and Secular Education in the Middle Ages," December 1982*

----------, "Traditional Jewish Learning: Philosophy and Practice," December 1981 (Working Draft)*

----------, "History of the Ideas of Human Perfectibility, Utopia, and Progress: The Greek to the Enlightenment," August 1982

----------,"Ancient Buddhist Education," April 1983*

----------, "Quranic Schooling: Setting, Context and Process," May 1983*

----------, "Traditional Indian Education, April 1982*

Pria, Maria Teresa, "Taller Sobre Potencial Humano," March 1983

Quintanilla C., Josefina I., "Hacia Una Madurez Permanente Un Modelo Mexicano de Preparacion a la Jubilacion," March 1983

Ramanujam, B.K., "Social Change and Personal Crisis: A View from an Indian Practise," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

----------, "Response to Social Change in India," June 1982

----------, "Technical Issues of Psychotherapy in India,"

----------, "India: A Case Study,"

----------, "The Indian Family: Pattern and Process," March, 1980

----------, "Odyssey of an Indian Villager: Mythic Orientations in Psychotherapy,"

Sanneh, Lamin, "Healing and Conversion in New Religious Movements in Africa: Elements of an Indigenous Epistemology," January 1983*

----------, "Source and Influence: A Comparative Approach to Religion and Culture," April 1983 to appear in The Cultural Transition....PHP 1984*

Scheffler, Israel, "Pondering Potentiality," December 1980 (Working Paper)

Scheffler, Israel, "Prevention, Power, and Potential," April, 1981 (Working Notes)

Scheffler, Israel, "Harvard's Potential Project: A Synthetic Sketch," August, 1981

Shiang, Julia, "'Heart' and Self in Old Age: A Chinese Model," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

Sidibe, B.K. and Galloway, Winifred F., "Senegambian Traditional Families," January 1983

Sidibe, B.K. and Galloway, Winifred F., "Women in Traditional Gambian Society--Past, Present and Future," January 1983

Skrzyniarz, William J., "A Review of Projects to Develop Intelligence and Developmental, Philosophical, Policy, and Cultural Perspectives on Intellectual Potential," November 1981

Strauss, Claudia, "Beyond 'Formal' vs. 'Informal' Education," May 1983*

Taber, Sara, "Problems and Costs of Modern Education: Its Effects on Women," January 1981 (First Draft)*

Taniuchi, Lois K., "The Creation of Prodigies Through Special Early Education: Three Case Studies," March 1980

----------, "Psychological Themes in Japanese Mother-Child Socialization and their Influence on other Indigenous Learning Situations," April 1981 (Working Draft)

----------, "Talent Education: A Case Study of Cultural Adaptation," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

Taniuchi, Lois, White, Merry and Pollak, Susan, "Draft Summary Bernard van Leer Project on Human Potential Workshop on United States and Japanese Perspectives on Potential," July 15-21, 1981

Vasco, Carlos E., "Learning Elementary School Mathematics as a Culturally Conditioned Process," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

----------, "Tagging Along with the Urban Poor in Colombia 1973-1983" March 1983*

Voutira, Eftihia, "Is a Science of Human Potential Possible?" July 1980 (Draft)

Wagner, Daniel, "The Making of a Fqih," to appear in The Cultural Transition.... PHP, 1984*

Walters, J. and Gardner, H. "Intelligences." To appear in R. Wagner and R. Sternberg, ed., Practical Intelligences, in press.

Walters, J. and Gardner, H. "The Crystallizing Experience: Discovering an Intellectual Gift." 1984 (to appear in R. Sternberg & J. Davidson (Eds.), Conceptions of Giftedness.

Walters, J. and Gardner, H. "The Development and Education of Intelligences. In 1985 Yearbook on Intellectual Development, F. Link (Ed.). Washington, D. C.: Curriculum Development Associates, 1984.

White, Merry I. and Taniuchi, Lois K., "The Anatomy of the Hara: Japanese Self in Society," May 1980 (Working Draft)*

White, Merry I., "Workshop on Human Potential," Cairo, Egypt, January 1982

*Papers marked with an asterisk (*) are available through ERIC, the Educational Research Information Center. Most Education libraries offer access to this service.

Papers by Dr. Howard Gardner, Professor Robert LeVine, and Professor Israel Scheffler may be obtained by writing to them at Harvard Graduate School of Education.

All other papers can be obtained by writing to Dr. Merry White, also at Harvard Graduate School of Education, Appian Way, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138.

August, 1984